

BACONIANA.

VOL. I. *New Series.* APRIL, 1903.

No. 2.

AS OTHERS SEE US.

"Truth is never without a scratched face."

THE past quarter has witnessed interesting and important developments, and it may be instructive to briefly review the attitude of the public Press towards us. BACONIANA in its new form attracted general attention, and inspired considerable comment. The majority of our critics contented themselves by quoting extracts. "If BACONIANA," said *The Westminster Gazette*, "can only keep up to this standard, it promises to be excellent reading." *The Morning Post* concedes that "the day is past when contemptuous epithets were deemed a sufficient answer to the adherents of Bacon."

Unfortunately, epithets, though overworn and out of date, are still with us. The music of *The Sphere* is, for instance, peculiarly discordant. On January 31st it concluded an editorial paragraph as follows:—

"Meanwhile, I note that the stupid people who call themselves Baconians—the foolish cranks with whom Mr. Mallock has allied himself—have just started a magazine called BACONIANA. It is a mad world."

It is indeed a mad world, and contains many strange and perplexing occupants!

Only too many of our critics are content to exhibit "the wan mirth of the mirthless Fool," or to fall back upon the emission of a torrent of wild and whirling words. They run up and down the scale of abuse from light and airy persiflage to scurrility not unworthy of Billingsgate. A very ancient and a fish-like smell hangs heavy in the columns of *The Literary World*. Here is a characteristic sample :—

"One feature of the controversy referred to in the above title is that a small cluster of lawyers, *soi-disant* lawyers at any rate, have rushed into the fray in a way that would disgrace their order, if they were of any importance, but which, as things stand, merely disgrace themselves. One brings to bear the cunning of a dis-barr'd pettifogger; another, out of sheer vacuity, swallows whole the stupid and second-hand concoctions of Mrs. Gallup; and all agree in their ignorance (or is it wilful suppression?) and malignant distortion of nearly every pertinent fact, and in perpetrating the grossest libels upon the greatest Englishmen of three hundred years ago. At the opposite pole, as regards sanity, knowledge, and ability, stands His Honour Judge Willis, as beseems a man of his former brilliant achievements at the University of London—completed by carrying off the great gold medal at the LL.D. Examination. With the subject he here treats of he has a close acquaintance."

From this it would appear that, according to this scribe, Lord Penzance and His Honour Judge Webb, because they have adopted the Baconian side in the controversy, are "*soi-disant* lawyers," and "have rushed into the fray in a way that would disgrace their order, if they were of any importance, but which, as things stand, merely disgrace themselves." This is strange argument! Who is the writer—Penzance or Webb?—

who "brings to bear the cunning of a dis-barr'd pettifogger?" and who is the other—Penzance or Webb?—who "out of sheer vacuity, swallows whole the stupid and second-hand concoctions of Mrs. Gallup?" The same critic, referring to the *Trial* of Judge Willis, says: "We are very sorry to note a number of misprints, due perhaps to the author's skill with the pen." This is the most original excuse for misprints that we have ever seen. Shakespeare's son, it appears, twice appears as *Samuel* instead of *Hamnet*!

On February 20th *The Literary World* printed the following curiosity of literature:—

"The worm will turn. 'C.K.S.,' in his ever-interesting literary letter in *The Sphere*, says: 'I much regret *The Pall Mall Magazine* should injure otherwise excellent numbers by articles on the Shakspeare-Bacon craze. I would not willingly be in the society of a man who believed that Bacon wrote Shakespeare, or that we English are one of the lost ten tribes of Israel. Why, therefore, should I wish to meet these crude and ignorant opinions in a magazine that contains much that is worth reading?'"

Why does *The Literary World* term Mr. Clement K. Shorter a "worm?"

From this atmosphere of prejudice, fret, and vulgarity, it is refreshing to turn to the scholarly attacks made upon Mr. W. H. Mallock's *Pall Mall Magazine* articles by Father Thurston in the columns of *The Tablet*. The force of Mr. Mallock's articles is neutralised by Father Thurston's explanation that the *Faerie Queene* title-page was originally used for Sidney's *Arcadia*, and that the suggested "hanged hog" is merely part of the Sidney crest—a porcupine with an heraldic collar and chain.

Readers of Mr. Mallock's *Pall Mall* articles should refer to *The Tablet* of January 10th and February 7th,

and to an article by Mr. Walter W. Greg, which appears in *The Library* (February, 1903), entitled "Facts and Fancies in Baconian Theory."

The February number of *The National Review* contained an attack upon Judge Webb, under the title of "Shakespeare's contemporaries." The writer of the article appears to be incapable of distinguishing between testimony to Shakespeare the *writer* and allusions to Shaksper the *man*.

On January 3rd *The Westminster Gazette* printed an important letter from Mr. Samuel Waddington, in which some remarkable parallels between Bacon's Sonnet and the Shakespeare Plays were pointed out.

In the same paper Mr. Ough and Mr. Stronach subsequently drew attention to further parallelisms. We would reproduce these but for the fact that the reader must by now have grown somewhat weary of parallelisms. Sufficient have been printed to satisfy the shrewd, and more would be insufficient to convince the dull.

Baconians have everywhere been much in evidence recently in the correspondence columns of the Press. That admirable fighter, Mr. George Stronach, has well maintained our position, not only in *Public Opinion*, but in *The Morning Post*, *The Lady*, *Notes and Queries*, and elsewhere.

A correspondent of *Notes and Queries* makes a spirited attack upon Dr. Theobald, and endeavours to show that what we believe to be some of the strongest parallels between Bacon and Shakespeare were in reality common to other writers of the period. We shall deal with this article in the next issue of BACONIANA.

ELIZABETHAN MANNERS AND MORALS.

IN his recently-published "*Judicial Summing Up*," Lord Penzance alludes to the statement of Pope, that many of the coarsenesses that disfigure the Plays of Shakespeare were interpolated by actors animated by ambition to raise laughter from the groundlings. The theory is an agreeable one, but, is it tenable? It is improbable that the Plays as we possess them are precisely as they came from the mind of their author; but if, as is now supposed, Bacon supervised their publication, he must surely be held responsible for not a few of the passages and expressions that dismay the modern reader. Coarseness that can be condoned in an actor becomes culpable in the mouth of a philosophic aristocrat; indeed, not a few will consider it to be irreconcilable with that nobility of purpose that is now being claimed for the Elizabethan drama.

The love that is felt towards Shakespeare has led many commentators to reject as spurious, not only passages, but entire Plays, deemed to be unworthy of him. It is not our purpose to exhibit this officious solicitude for his fame and morals, but rather to note a few facts, the significance of which appears to have altogether eluded Shakespeare's editors.

It is an axiom that no writer can be judged *per se* in the abstract, but only in relation to the manners and customs by which he was environed, nor can we judge the morals of one age by the manners of another. Brand in his "*Antiquities*" observes that "the ancient grossness of our manners would almost exceed belief." On page 296 he gives one peculiarly striking example taken from a *Morality play*. Since then, particularly during the past sixty years, social conditions have so

immensely improved that it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand or realise the sheer barbarism that prevailed when Shakespeare wrote. Dazzled by the literature of the period, commentators have fallen into the error of measuring the 16th century by Shakespeare. The process should, of course, be reversed, and Shakespeare measured by the savagery of his surroundings.

The true story of the period will, perhaps, never be made public, for no one will dare to print the actual truth. Yet the facts are attainable, and in justice to the writers of the time, should be kept in mind.

Historians tell us that the Court of James discarded the veil of chivalry and courtesy that shrouded the degrading grossness of the preceding reign. Except that picturesque and illusive mist in which time and tradition beautifies every far distance, it is difficult to perceive that any such a veil ever existed; indeed, it is clear that the conditions that prevailed in the Elizabethan Court differed little from semi-barbarism.

The details of Seymour's courtship of the Princess Elizabeth are sufficiently gross, and in later years there are few indications of improvement. Her Majesty the Queen, "despite her culture and insinuating speech, . . . used terrible oaths, round and full; she stamped her feet, she thrust about her with a sword, she spat upon her attendants, and behaved, as the French said, like a lioness" (Goadby). She was also accused of having broken the finger of one and gashed the hand of another of her ladies-in-waiting.

There is a strange anecdote of high life recorded by Bacon in his "Apophthegms;" strange, because it is cited as an example of neat and courtly repartee; stranger for the murky light it throws upon the manners and customs of a period when such things were

tolerated or possible. The anecdote is that concerning the King of France, his Queen-consort, and the *debonair* behaviour of Count Soissons.

Men and women in those days were amazingly brutal! They fed upon fare, the bare mention of which is repulsive. Hollinshed gives a description of the disgusting food that was popular among ladies of fashion. Tea and coffee were unknown; vegetables were esteemed merely as medicine. The Queen and her ladies-in-waiting breakfasted upon meat and beer. Forks—bifurcated daggers—were not introduced into England until 1611. Until then, men and women hacked off their meat with their daggers. It is distressing to realise that Shakespeare's heroines shovelled their food into their mouths with their fingers!

An objector wrote recently to the Press proving triumphantly that Shaksper was a genuine author, *because* Bacon by no possibility could have been acquainted, in the unwholesome and artificial atmosphere of the Court, with the types of feminine virtue and purity that figure throughout the Plays. There is, of course, some truth in this. How often and often in the old drama does one come across repulsive language put into the mouth of the virtuous Court lady. Such diction was obviously regarded as no more coarse or immoral than is a pungent piece of slang in the mouth of a modern maiden. "Swear me, Kate," says Hotspur in *Henry IV.* "Swear me, Kate, *like a lady as thou art*, a good mouth-filling oath."

Shakespeare's heroines could never have been limned from life in the English Court. They are rather the spiritual ideals of that miraculous brain upon which, as upon an instrument, Heaven itself was playing.

Cleanliness and sanitation were practically unknown quantities to the Elizabethans. The scavenging of the

streets was left mainly to birds of prey ; over the narrow and dirty roadways hovered the carrion kite. To hide the unpleasant condition of the houses, the floors were periodically strewed with rushes. This served successfully to disguise the *dirt*, but even the stalwart Elizabethan nostril recoiled at the *odour*, and it became usual to carry a so-called casting bottle—a small utensil carried in the pocket, containing perfume with which the owner disinfected his surroundings.

There is, perhaps, no better method of gaining an insight into the moral atmosphere of the Elizabethan period than to study the contemporary drama. Many Plays are unquestionably transcripts from actual life. Schlegel says without exaggeration that “the indecencies in which these poets (the Elizabethan dramatists) allowed themselves to indulge, exceed all conception. The licentiousness of the language is the least evil ; many scenes, nay, many whole plots, are so contrived that the very idea of them, not to mention the sight, is a gross insult to modesty.”

Viewed from a modern standpoint, this is unquestionable ; but, *as seen by contemporaries, the works in question were miracles of morality and nobleness.* There is abundant evidence of the accuracy of this statement. The playwrights themselves evidently had not the slightest perception of their own impropriety, nor, apparently, had any of the audience. Indeed, it is quite customary for what we should call nowadays “Problem Plays,” to be prefixed by testimony from an array of public men, to the effect that here will be found “wit *untainted by obscenity*,” that “Plautus and Aristophanes were scurrile wits and buffoons in comparison,” that so-and-so writes “strong and clear,” that herein

“ No vast uncivil bulk swells any scene,
The strength ingenious and the vigour *clean*.”

Perhaps the Plays of Phillip Massinger display a greater coarseness than those of his predecessors, yet no one that has studied this noble writer will quarrel with the obvious truth that Massinger was "a high-minded artist."

All the evidence tends unmistakably to prove that unnatural horrors from which the modern mind recoils with disgust were, in the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, matters of commonplace occurrence, and considered as fit themes for dramatisation.

The prime and one and only acceptable jest of the period appears to have been to "adhorn" or "cornute" one's neighbour. Chapman in "*All Fools*" (1599) writes bitterly :—

"The course of the world (like the life of man) is said to be divided into several ages. As we into infancy, childhood, youth, and so forward to old age, so the world into the Golden Age, the Silver, the Brass, the Iron, the Leaden, the Wooden, and now into this present age, which we term the *Horned Age* (*italics, Chapman's*), not that but our former ages have enjoyed this benefit as well as our times, but that in ours it is more common."

On St. Luke's Day (St. Luke was the patron saint of Cuckolds!) there was held an orgie known as Horn Fair. Unless the old dramatists grossly libelled and misrepresented the women of the period, chastity was so rare a virtue as to be almost unknown. It is pathetically funny to observe how almost invariably in the Elizabethan drama any woman who repels an admirer's advances is hailed in a flowery oration as a miracle of virtue, a very Phœnix of the age, the sole Arabian bird, a Nonpareil at whose name future generations will incredulously wonder.

Marston in "*The Scourge of Villainy*" (1599) writes :—

"O split my heart, lest it do break with rage,
To see th' immodest looseness of our age !

Immodest looseness? Fie! too gentle word!
 When every sign can brothelry afford,
 When lust doth sparkle from our females' eyes,
 And modesty is routed to the skies."

It is a continual wonder to many how the brutal Elizabethan crowds could have patiently sat through some of Shakespeare's Plays. They have to be mercilessly cut and pruned to render them acceptable to a West End audience at the present day. To the Elizabethan auditor, how infinitely more must much of their philosophy have been *caviare*!

Speaking of the brutality of the 18th century mob—and we may be fairly sure that the nation's manners had improved rather than deteriorated—Sir Walter Besant alludes to it as "brutal beyond all power of words to describe, or imagination to understand; so bestial that one is induced to think that there has never been in any town or in any age a population which could compare with them."

Spenser bewails the "ugly barbarism and brutish ignorance" of his times, and refers to the world as "a den of wickedness, deformed with filth and foul iniquity."

The anonymous author of "*Timon of Athens*" (1600) writes:—

"Earth's worse than Hell; let Hell change place with Earth."

Nash, in "*Summer's Last Will and Testament*," published in the same year (1600), utters the same thought:—

"Earth is Hell, true Hell felicity compared with this world, this den of wolves."

Marston in "*The Scourge of Villainy*" (1599) laments the

"Foul odious sin
In which our swinish times be wallowing."

Peele, Ben Jonson, Ford, indeed almost every writer of the period adds his testimony to the same effect.

When the world realises the true social conditions of the 16th century, we shall hear no more about Shakespeare's "coarseness," and the appreciation of Elizabethan literature will have begun. We shall marvel how flowers so stately and so fair could ever have reared their heads amid surroundings so "swinish."

WARWICKSHIRE WORDS.

THE following recently appeared in *Black and White* :—

BACON *v.* SHAKESPEARE.—I notice that Sir Norman Lockyer, who is himself a Warwickshire man, has been writing to a Stratford-on-Avon correspondent on the Bacon-Shakespeare question. Sir Norman is mistaken, however, in thinking that he is the first to discover strong evidence against the Baconians in the numerous Warwickshire words used by Shakespeare and unlikely to have been familiar to Bacon. Many learned papers have been written on this subject. But I am glad to make a note of it, if only to record Sir Norman's high praise of Mr George Morley's little book, *Shakespeare's Greenwood*, "the accuracy and value of which," he says, "my old memories enable me to test." There is no man in England to-day who knows Shakespeare's country as Mr. Morley does or who has written about it so well. He is one of those authors who are writing their hearts into their books and receiving shamefully little recompense for their work.—J. A. H.

Once upon a time Mr. Appleton Morgan, President of the Shakespeare Society of New York, gave a glossary of 518 words which he claimed as Warwickshire words, and presumably used by Shakespeare. Mrs. Pott at once took up the challenge, and proved conclusively

that of the 518 "pure Warwickshire words," there were only 46 which are not as current in Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Wiltshire, Hampshire, Lincolnshire, and Leicestershire as they are in Warwickshire, and that not one of these 46 words, not recognised as common in the Southern and Eastern counties, is to be found in *Shakespeare*! Since that date the English Dialect Society's splendid Dictionary has been in course of publication, and entirely confirms the contention of Mrs. Pott.

Curious to see what *Black and White's* Warwickshire authority, Mr. George Morley, had to say on the subject, I obtained a copy of his book "*Shakespeare's Greenwood*," and have given it careful study.

On page 31 I read: "As a dialect word, *fend* is also common among the urban folk of Staffordshire, but, so far as I have been able to gather, it is only used in the rural districts of Warwickshire, and there quite frequently." On turning up the Dialect Dictionary, I find that the word is used in the same sense, "to work," in Shetland and Orkney, all over Scotland, in Northumberland, Durham, Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Cheshire.

On page 36, the word "blench," a glance or a look, is given as another peculiar Warwickshire word. In the Dictionary, so far from it having "a totally different signification in the dialect of the Warwickshire peasant" from that of other peasants, as Mr. Morley maintains, it is used with the same signification in Cheshire, Staffordshire, and Derbyshire.

Then on page 45, it appears that "cade," as "the rustic's pet name for anything that is tame, mild, or gentle," is "a well-known Warwickshire word, peculiar, I believe, to '*Shakespeare's Greenwood*,' where so many terms of dialect have their origin and their permanent habitation." Mr. Morley's belief may be somewhat

rudely shaken by the information in the Dialect Dictionary that the word is used in exactly the same sense in Yorkshire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Rutlandshire, Leicestershire, Worcestershire, Shropshire, Herefordshire, Berkshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Kent. Nothing very "peculiar" about "cade," therefore.

Then we are told that the word "moither," for mother, "is indigenous to the soil of urban as well as rural Warwickshire." It is nothing of the kind. The Dictionary says, "it is in dialect use in Scotland, Ireland, and the Midland Counties, in Rutland, Montgomery, and Gloucestershire."

Then, "othergates" for otherwise "has that certain picturesque effect so peculiar to the Warwickshire dialect," although it is as "peculiar" to Cumberland, Yorkshire, and Lancashire. So with "colly" for dark, "a word as quaint as it is singular," which it is not, so far as Warwickshire is concerned. Then, "no such word as the truly Shakespearean word *moil* in the dialect of the Warwickshire rustic is more expressive than this." The word is in general use, according to the Dictionary, in Scotland, England, and Ireland. Next, "the *lace* mentioned in the above instance," according to Mr. Morley, "has a peculiar meaning in the lingo of the Warwickshire peasant; it literally means to beat or thrash." It has exactly the same meaning in other twenty-three counties of England!

And so on with the "peculiar Warwickshire" Shakespearean significations of "doxy," "faggot," "hussey," "call," and "batlet," all of them in common use all over the whole country. In regard to the last-named word, Mr. Morley writes: "In the course of their laundry-work the Warwickshire housewives may frequently be heard calling out, 'Hey, but you mun give me the batlet.' Now the word *batlet* is direct from

Shakespeare's time. . . . The *batlet* of Shakespeare is the 'dolly' of the modern housewife—a modern machine or bat, for beating or dollying the house linen. It was also known as 'the maiden,' by which name it is dignified to-day by many of the homely women of the Warwickshire greenwood. 'Come, bring me the maiden;' 'I mun hev the batlet;' 'Where's the dolly?' are terms in every day use, and are clearly indicative of the hold which Shakespeare's tongue has upon the rustics of his own greenwood." Now this is all very pretty, but it is pure romance, according to the Dialect Dictionary, which states that the word *batlet* is obsolescent in Yorkshire and obsolete in Warwickshire, and that the use of the word at the present day is "not known to our correspondents in Warwickshire." Mr. Wise made the like mistake in 1861—the same Mr. Wise who stated that "bolter" (used in *Macbeth*) was "peculiarly a Warwickshire word, signifying to clot, collect, or cake." The word is used with the same signification in Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire, and East Anglia, according to the Dialect Dictionary, which has completely demolished the "peculiar Warwickshire dialect" in the Shakespearean Plays. I am afraid Mr. Morley's "accurate and valuable" book sadly needs revision—at least, he must abandon his claim that "the dialect of the Warwickshire rustic . . . is more nearly allied to the language of the English Bible and the works of Shakespeare than the dialect of any other English county." This is entirely disproved by the new Dialect Dictionary.

“SHAKESPEARE’S PROSE.”

SPEDDING, Bacon’s great biographer, wrote: “I doubt whether there are five lines together to be found in Bacon which could be mistaken for Shakespeare, or five lines in Shakespeare which could be mistaken for Bacon.” Spedding was unaware, when he wrote this *dictum*, that one-third of the Shakespearean Dramas was written in prose. My authority for this statement is Mr. Sidney Lee; and if Spedding had examined the Shakespearean prose as closely as he did that of Bacon and compared the two, his verdict would have been considerably qualified.

It has been held over and over again that the humour of Falstaff could not have been produced by Bacon. Here is one of Falstaff’s speeches:—

“It is a wonderful thing to see the semblable coherence of his men’s spirits and his: they, by observing of him, do bear themselves like foolish justices; he, by conversing with them, is turned into a justice-like serving-man: their spirits are so married in conjunction with the participation of society that they flock together in consent, like so many wild-geese. If I had a suit to Master Shallow, I would humour his men with the imputation of being near their master: if to his men, I would curry with Master Shallow that no man could better command his servants. It is certain that either wise bearing or ignorant carriage is caught, as men take diseases, one of another: therefore let men take heed of their company.”

Is this speech not thoroughly Baconian both in sentiment and language? Those who think otherwise would do well to consult the proof given by Dr. Theobald on pages 280 and 282 of his “*Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light*.” The parallel passages he

adduces, illustrating the ideas in the speech drawn from the writings of Bacon, are conclusive evidence of identity in thought and style. The whole passage has a genuine Baconian ring about it which is irresistible to a reader of Bacon's works. In fact it is more Baconian than Falstaffian, and might have appeared in one of Bacon's "*Essays*."

Take again Macbeth's letter to his wife:—"They met me in the day of success; and I have learned by the perfectest report they have more in them than mortal knowledge. When I burned in desire to question them further, they made themselves air, into which they vanished. While I stood rapt in the wonder of it, came missives from the King, who all-hailed me 'Thane of Cawdor,' by which title before these weird sisters saluted me, and referred me to the coming on of time with 'Hail, King, that shalt be!' This have I thought good to deliver thee, my dearest partner of greatness, that thou mightest not lose the dues of rejoicing by being ignorant of what greatness is promised thee. Lay it to thy heart, and farewell." Is this not Baconian language? Why, it reads like a passage from the "*History of Henry VII.*" Comparison will show that the language is not that of Holinshed, as I may be informed by some learned Shakespearean. And is the following from *Hamlet* not thoroughly Baconian? "This is a gift that I have; simple, simple, a foolish, extravagant spirit, full of forms, figures, shapes, objects, ideas, apprehensions, motives, revolutions; these are begot in the ventricle of memory, nourished in the womb of *pia mater*, and deliver'd upon the mellowing of occasion." Not only is this passage Baconian, but it must have been written by a man acquainted with medical science.

G. S.

A TRIAL AT BAR.

ANOTHER champion of Shakspeare has published his cogitations.* In this book Mr. William Willis, K.C., as Treasurer of the Inner Temple, explains how the members of the Inn were recently, by him, spoon-fed (to use a phrase of Browning) with *the* truth of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy.

Mr. Willis holds the view that the dispute could best be determined by a trial legally conducted in which all hearsay evidence or second-hand information would be excluded.

His book therefore takes shape as a report of a supposed trial in 1630, of the authorship questions. The report, Mr. Willis tells us, seemed so natural to some of his auditors that they actually asked him to permit inspection of the manuscript! It may yet acquire the status of a venerable authority.

The scholarly works of Mr. Bompas and Mr. Theobald appear to have been the disposing cause of these efforts of Mr. Willis, K.C., "ad captandum vulgus" in sequel, if not in intention.

Messrs. Theobald and Bompas are not permitted to state their own case. Instead, their names appear at ghostly intervals adown the margins of the book, like idlers in the Court of Justice conceived in the brain of Mr. Willis, K.C., who leaves us to imagine that they had occasionally interrupted the proceedings with remarks promptly shown to be "fatuous."

Let me in the limits available for this notice examine the evidence which Mr. Willis brings into Court, and in doing so I prefer to adhere much more strictly than he to the conditions of inquiry laid down in the author's preface, by excluding the guesses and irrevelancies in

* "The Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy." By W. Willis, K.C.

which he permits himself through the mouths of his puppets to indulge.

The case of Mr. Willis and his friends is that the actor Shakspeare wrote the Plays of the First Folio. That of orthodox Baconians, so ably represented by Messrs. Theobald and Bompas, is that Bacon wrote the Plays, and that the actor Shakspeare permitted such of them as were produced or published during his lifetime to be passed off as having been written by him.

Mr. Willis opens his case by putting in as evidence a number of old books which I will admit as documents for the purpose of the inquiry. Let us further agree that anything which purports to be printed as a statement over the printed name of some person shall be treated as the evidence in chief of the witness, to be confuted only by proved inaccuracies, inconsistent statements, and the general trend of circumstantial evidence.

Mr. Willis also puts in evidence the only five signatures of the actor, which have been preserved. He thinks that a careful examination of one of them will shew that the actor once spelt his name Shakespeare. Further, that in two deeds the name is written Shakespeare, although not so signed. How this advances the claim, I fail to appreciate. It shews a curious indifference for a literary man.

Now let me take the witnesses in order of date.

Greene, in *A Groatsworth of Wit* (1592), is believed to have alluded to Shakespeare. Yes, not as an author, but as an "upstart crow" beautified in other's feathers.

Barnfield's allusion in 1598 to Shakespeare and *Venus and Adonis* carries us no further than do prints of the poem in 1593. I know the book I am reviewing, but I have no knowledge of the person who wrote it.

In July, 1593, when *Venus and Adonis* was published and dedicated in the name of Shakespeare to Earl South-

ampton, the latter was a Royal ward of Court, aged 20 years, and had been three years a student of Gray's Inn, where Bacon also resided. Marlowe, whose name is also suspected to have been used as a mask, had died a few weeks before. Mr. Willis will find in Boas' *Life of Kyd* a curious original letter of about this date, in which Marlowe is mentioned as "bearing name to serve my lord." Southampton either knew or did not know whether the real author was dedicating the poem. His testimony is of no value.

Meres, in *Wit's Treasury*, 1598, alludes to the existence of Sonnets privately circulated, and to twelve Plays as by Shakespeare, four of which had previously been published anonymously, and three others were not printed until the folio.

Meres evidently knew something, but we cannot gather from these observations that he was identifying the actor as author. He was engaged at that time in collecting and publishing a series of apothegms, probably part of the scheme of "collections" which Bacon was, from his letter of 28th January, 1595, promoting. Meres was buried according to the practice usual amongst members of the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross.

From this date onward to 1609 a number of Plays and some poems are published as written by Shakespeare. The ascription is equally consistent with an author signing his name to his own works, and with his acting as mask for another.

Mr. Willis's next witnesses, taking them in order of date, are : Chester, 1601 ; Camden, 1605 ; Walley, 1609, and Walkley, 1622.

Chester speaks of publishing *Love's Martyr*, a poem subscribed with the name of the writer, William Shake-speare. Camden compares with Catullus "Shakespheare" and "Barlowe's" fragment, and

mentions Shakespeare with Sidney and other writers as pregnant wits of his time. Walley publishes a new Play, *Troilus and Cresseid*, as written by Shakespeare, and speaks of it as "never *stal'd with the stage*, never clapper clawed with the palmes of the vulgar," and as "not being sullied with the smoky breath of the multitude."

Whoever wrote the words, the sentiments are Baconian. An actor would hardly have made such a commendation.

Walkley prints *Othello* as written by Shakespeare, and states that the author was dead.

The evidence of these witnesses amounts to nothing more than that they may have or may not have known the facts. What, then, is its value?

Chettle's allusion to Shakespeare is very doubtful, and Willobie's of no value.

Forty Quartos of the Plays are published with Shakespeare's name; thirty appear without it. Once more I say that the named quartos are not inconsistent with the Baconian assumptions; that the name was used by arrangement, and that Bacon who in one of his published prayers said, "Though in a despised weed, I have sought the good of all men," was the same person who in the Shakespeare Sonnet wrote:—

"Why write I thus ever the same,
And keep invention in a noted weed?"

I have now disposed of every fact capable of being deposed to by witnesses prior in date to the Folio.

Mr. Willis calls, at his stage, Heminge and Condell, the two introducers, and Blount and Jaggard, two of the publishers of the Folio edition of the Plays, the Earls Pembroke and Montgomery, to whom it was dedicated, and three writers of the poetic addresses it contained, namely, Jonson, Holland, and Digges. He

also calls William Basse and John Selden. All that Basse can prove is that a verse attributed to him, alluding to Shakespeare, was first published as one of Donne's poems in 1633. Inference from its likeness to Jonson's poem in the Folio suggests its possible existence in 1623. Selden can tell us absolutely nothing beyond the fact that, like Bacon, he in his works nowhere alludes to Shakespeare.

To return to the Folio witnesses. The Earls Pembroke and Montgomery, and Blount, Jaggard, and Holland, can only state the fact that they are parties to the publication of a work stated to have been written by the deceased actor of Stratford-on-Avon.

The Earls were associated with one secret society. If they were also members of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood, it was in accord with the rules thereof to aid in the dissemination of works published under pseudonyms. The witness Digges might have been asked in cross-examination to explain his lines:—

“ When that stone is rent,
And time dissolves thy Stratford monument,
Here we alive shall see thee still ! ”

The witness Heminge was stated to be elderly, and the witness Condell to be feeble. Whether Mr. Willis anticipated that these two witnesses would break down under cross-examination, one cannot say, but their joint statement has more than once been shewn to be ambiguous and untrustworthy.

They state that they have collected the Plays, and that the public had been “abus'd with stol'n and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealths of imposters.” This is belied by the facts as we know them. Comparison of the quartos with the Folio shews that most of the Plays had been much revised, expanded, and in some cases almost rewritten.

Printers' errors are repeated shewing that some of the quartos were used as "copy" in the preparation of the folio; which thus impugns Heminge and Condell's statement that the Folio was printed from manuscript. Their statement moreover about not having "received from him a blot in his papers" has long ago been shewn to be moonshine. And why was it not "our province who only gather his works and give them to you, to praise him?" Heminge and Condell did not bear the expense of this very costly work published by Bacon's own publisher. Surely they might have felt at liberty to praise it? But if the person who once wrote, "I take all knowledge for my province," had written this ambiguous dedication, he might well have paused in praising his own work. It is curious that Bacon in his letter to Villiers should have used a similar reference to country fruits to that in the dedication, and that the address to the readers should have in four lines the legal terms "arraign," "tryal," "appeals," "quitted," and "decree of court."

Surely Mr. Willis missed a point in not arguing that Shakspeare obtained his legal knowledge from rubbing shoulders with Heminge and Condell!

The witness, Ben Jonson, covered much ground that he knew nothing about, and many traditions, which even Mr. Willis might have discarded. For instance, a statement given as a fact that Jonson visited Shakspeare and Stratford in 1616, has no better authority than that one John Ward, born thirteen years after, told the story to one Fulman, in 1663. The examination should have been confined to:—

1. What he wrote about Shakspeare in the actor's lifetime.
2. What he told Drummond in 1618.
3. What he wrote in 1623 in the Shakspeare Folio.
4. What he wrote in his *Discoveries*, published 1641.

Mr. Willis did not ask the witness what he meant by the verse (published in 1616, after the actor's death), beginning :—

“Poor Poet-Ape that would be thought our chief.”

But he did address a question concerning Thomas North, whose translation in 1579, of Plutarch's *Lives*, is so much drawn upon in the Plays. Perhaps he did not know that Bacon and North were together at the English Embassy in France from 1576 onwards.

The attention of the witness was drawn to his omission of Shakespeare and inclusion of Bacon in his list of greatest men, but not a word was put to him as to his naming Bacon “the mark and acme of our language.”

The explanation of his statement that Bacon “hath filled up all numbers, and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome” was about as feeble as poor old Condell himself. Perhaps Mr. Willis will tell us whether “numbers” refers to poetry or to a sum in simple addition.

Jonson might also have been asked to explain the following words in his *Discoveries* :—

“The writer must *lie*, and the gentle reader rests happy to have the worthiest works misinterpreted ;” or

“It is an art to have so much judgment as to apparel a lie well.”

No judge should direct a jury to accept Jonson's testimony as final, after hearing that. Or what did he mean in the *Discoveries*, “*De Shakespeare nostrat*” by the curious reservation (“whatsoever he penned”). Upon the Drummond conversations the witness should have been required to admit that Bacon was ready to joke about the poetical feet known as *spondaeus* and *dactylus*, and to explain why, if he attached importance

to an ascribed title, did he complain to Drummond of Sir Walter Raleigh taking credit for the authorship of the *History of the World*, although "a number of the best wits in England were employed in making it." Two questions might have been added. Explain your lines :—

"Thou art a monument without a tomb,"

and—

"Sweet Swan of Avon ! What a sight it were !

To see thee in our water *yet appear* ?"

And in his verse on Bacon's sixtieth birthday, what he meant by the line :—

"Thou stand'st as if some mystery thou didst ?"

I venture to affirm that Mr. Willis has entirely failed to prove his case. He has only three principal witnesses, and they all break down under cross-examination. He singularly fails to shew anything in the actor's birth, training, calling, and retired life, consistent with the knowledge of French and French authors ; of Italian and Italian authors ; of the classical authors, Ovid, Aristotle, Plato, Euripides, Cicero, Virgil, Seneca, Pliny, and many others shewn in the Plays. He entirely fails to explain how the actor, whose daughter could not sign her name, acquired the knowledge of law, politics, medicine, and astronomy, and many other abstruse subjects shewn in the Plays. Mr. Willis only attacks a fringe of the immense accumulation of circumstantial evidence in favour of Baconian authorship, arising from the known facts of Lord Bacon's career, and the identities of thought, expression, and even of mistake to be found both in the Plays and in Bacon's admitted works.

Mr. Theobald and Mr. Bompas have nothing to fear from this attack. The subject has, in the words of Mr. Theobald, "come to stay." Mr. Willis may have suc-

ceeded in tickling the ears of some groundlings of the Inner Temple; but the tide of a wider criticism is rising, and it may be wise for him to move back his chair. His book is of value as shewing the tottering weakness of the Shakespearian case when some attempt is made to present it in legal form, and with some show of regard to the rules of evidence.

PARKER WOODWARD.

A CROSS-EXAMINATION.

BY GEORGE STRONACH, M.A.

JUDGE WILLIS'S so-called "trial" is simply a farce, as it could not but be, with a Shakespearean judge, Shakespearean witnesses, Shakespearean counsel, Shakespearean jury (a "respectable" jury, Judge Willis admits), and not a single Baconian witness. Judge Willis called—through his Shakespearean judge—for Baconian witnesses, but he took care not to allow the production of one of them, although they were at hand, and the cross-examination he puts into the mouth of the counsel for the plaintiff is necessarily of the weakest and most irrelevant character, purposely framed to strengthen the case of the defendant. It would have been somewhat different if Judge Willis had been fair enough to have asked a Baconian to supply the cross-examination; and had a Baconian been cross-examiner I am confident he would have put several of the witnesses through their facings in a somewhat different fashion from what is produced in this "novel law case."

There is William Jaggard, for instance, "the piratical publisher," according to Mr. Sidney Lee.* Here is his testimony as a witness :—

* Pages 89, 182, 290, 390, 396.

"I am a stationer by trade. I was asked by Mr. Blount to join him in the publication of the folio volume. We received no money except what arose from the sale of the books. I saw the manuscripts from which the folio was printed. I cannot say in whose handwriting they were. The portrait is not unlike the features of Shakespeare. . . . I never added a single line to the manuscript, nor did anyone else to my knowledge."

Then we are informed "he was not cross-examined."
May I supply a little cross-examination?

Q. You printed and published, did you not, in 1599, a volume, "*The Passionate Pilgrim*," with the name of W. Shakespeare on the title-page as author?

A. I did.

Q. There were 20 pieces in all in the volume, and only 5 were written by Shakespeare? The bulk of the book was by Richard Barnfield and others?

A. That is so.

Q. For thirteen years you allowed this book to be read as the work of Shakespeare, and in 1612 you issued a third edition, still under Shakespeare's name as sole author, in which you included two new poems by Thomas Heywood, also given as the work of Shakespeare?

A. I did.

Q. Then Heywood protested against the robbery? What did *you* do?

A. I removed Shakespeare's name from a few copies.

Q. And continued selling the rest of the copies as Shakespeare's?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Shakespeare protest against this unwarranted use of his name?

A. No, Heywood did; but he stated that Shakespeare was "offended."

Q. But he was not "offended" at the use of his name during all these thirteen years, and would not have been "offended" had Heywood not raised objection? In fact, unless you and he had been found out?

A. Probably not.

Q. Why did you use Shakespeare's name?

A. It paid me to do so.

Q. Could the same deception not have been practised with other works ascribed to Shakespeare?

A. It might. In fact, it *was* practised. There were a number of plays issued with his name on the title page with which he had nothing to do.

Q. Have you any defence for Shakespeare and yourself passing off work as his which was written by other authors?

A. Other publishers did it, and I had as good a right to do what they did. It is the custom of the day, as you know.

Q. You saw the manuscript of the First Folio, and knew that it contained not a blot or a line erased, just as it flowed with ease from his pen?

A. That is so.

Q. You never saw Shakespeare's handwriting? [*Showing his signature*]. Was this like the penmanship of the Folio MS.?

A. Not a bit like it. That hand could never have penned the plays, especially "*The Merry Wives*" in 14 days.*

Q. Where is the MS. of the Folio?

A. I don't know. Nobody knows.

Q. Are you aware that "of the 16 plays of Shakespeare that were published in his lifetime, not one was published with his sanction?" †

A. I can quite believe it.

Q. And that "he made no audible protest when seven contemptible dramas in which he had no hand were published with his name or initials on the title-page?" ‡

A. That is also likely.

Q. He could not but have seen the printed copies of the printed plays, as well as of your "*Passionate Pilgrim*?"

A. He could not help seeing them. Everybody saw them.

Q. How do you account for his action?

A. He made all the money he wanted from the performances at the theatres, and did not care what became of them otherwise. He lived for money, not reputation.

Q. How do you account for your son Isaac's name appearing as printer, along with Blount's, of the Folio?

A. He was associated with me in my business.

Q. And he applied for the licence to print on 10th November, 1623?

A. Yes, I asked him to do so.

Q. But you never saw a copy of the First Folio complete?

A. Who says so?

Q. I say so. You made your will on 28th March, 1623, and you died before the First Folio was either licenced or issued. Your will was proved in London on 17th November, 1623. Is that so?

A. Exactly.

Q. What year is this?

A. 1627, I believe.

* Sidney Lee, p. 171. † *Ibid.*, p. 396. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 396.

Q. Who asked you to come here, four years after your death and burial?*

A. The defence considered my evidence was necessary for their purpose. Therefore I had to come.

Q. Do you think their case a strong one when they have to summon a man from the grave to give evidence on their behalf?

There was no reply. The judge said: "You can go down, Mr. Jaggard; mind the steps, and leave your address, please." The jury are visibly impressed—not in favour of Shakespeare, as in Judge Willis's book.

Then when Mr. Leonard Digges, "M.A., of Oxford," stands up, and says that "the plays in folio are very much as I heard them when they were acted," he might have been asked:—

Q. You contributed commendatory verses to the First Folio?

A. I did.

Q. Were these lines the original verses you sent to the Editors?

A. No. The verses I sent were too long and too eulogistic, and I wrote a shorter poem. The longer one was returned to me, and I mean to use it.†

Q. In this longer one you wrote:—

"Next Nature onely helpt him, for looke thorow
This whole Booke, thou shalt find he doth not borrow,
One phrase from Greekes, nor Latines imitate,
Nor once from vulgar Languages Translate,
Nor Plagiari-like from others gleane,
Nor begges he from each witty friend a Scene
To peece his Acts with, all that he doth write,
Is pure his owne, plot, language exquisite."

Q. You wrote these lines?

A. Yes, I wrote these lines.

Q. Are they true?

A. You are impertinent, sir. What do you mean?

Q. You are a Latin and Greek scholar, and yet can perceive no borrowing from the classics or other source in the plays, either in plot, idea, or expression?

* In *The Literary World*, of March 13, Judge Willis observes that Jaggard is not a "material" witness in the case. He certainly is not "material."

† It was used in the 1640 edition of the *Poems*, five years after Digges's death.

A. I think not.

Q. The plots were all Shakespeare's? He never borrowed his plots from untranslated Italian authors, as Cinthio and Ser Giovanni, nor collaborated with others, such as Fletcher, nor started his dramatic career by simply "adding, revising, and correcting other men's work?"*

A. I have heard it stated more than once.

Q. And yet you say he borrowed nothing, imitated nobody—"nature" did everything?

A. Well, perhaps, my statement is too strong.

Q. You were not personally acquainted with Shakespeare?

A. No. I simply wrote about his plays in the same strain as other men of the time did. The plays were sent out as Shakespeare's, and I do not know if he was capable of writing them or not. My lines were simply sympathetic.

Exit Digges. The jury are not greatly impressed with the value of Digges's "contemporary evidence."

Judge Willis in his "Prefatory Note" tells us that he transforms Heminge into a native of Stratford in order "to get, through his mouth, a slight sketch of the poet's early life." It is evident, therefore, that Judge Willis hadn't a man, woman, or child in Stratford who could render him similar service. And Heminge's testimony to what he could never possibly have seen is termed by Judge Willis—"evidence."

[*The cross-examination of Ben Jonson, and other Shakespearean witnesses, will appear in our next issue.*—ED.]

IT has been said that in the constructing of Shakspeare's Dramas there is, apart from all other "faculties," as they are called, an understanding manifested, equal to that in Bacon's *Novum Organum*. That is true; and it is not a truth that strikes everyone.—*Carlyle*.

* Sidney Lee, p. 59.

WOLFENBÜTTEL AND ITS PLAYERS.

"The action of the theatre . . . many wise men have thought it as the bow to the fiddle."—*Advancement of Learning*.

BEFORE touching the main point of our subject, let us make closer acquaintance with Wolfenbüttel, that we may clear the ground and understand the mind of Francis St Alban when he alluded to it in the "State of Christendom."

In Spedding's edition of his works we find him speaking of "Heinrich Julius, Duke of Brunswick, and his strong castle of Wolfenbüttel on the Occer."*

The Duchy of Brunswick lies in the south part of the circle of Lower Saxony, specially interesting to us English people both for this reason and also because it was the patrimony of the Guelphs. Ernest, Duke in the year 1545, divided it between his two sons, founding two principalities—Brunswick-Luneberg and Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. The capital of this duchy is old-world, little frequented, ill-paved, quaint Wolfenbüttel, with its six thousand inhabitants, encircled by the green banks of the Ochre, whose narrow thread, within the town, is spanned by low bridges and overhung by gabled houses like a miniature Adriatic.

Only seven miles from busy Brunswick, it hugs the memory of a brilliant past, unconcerned with modern activities. True, electric trams rush through its beautiful beech forest, but only a stray passenger ever enters the town, unless to search the treasures of its fine library, or to form part of the audience in its tiny theatre on a Saturday *matinée*.

The two attractions of Wolfenbüttel, for strangers, are practically the same to-day as they were 300 years ago. These are the Ducal Theatre and the Ducal

* Spedding interpolates "*Oder*" by way of improving on Bacon !

Library. The theatre, approached by the open courtyard, with its historical trees, is the kernel of the Castle, as it was when Bacon penned his "State of Christendom;" and the library, a fine modern building, faces the moated residence, which is now derogated to the use of a ladies' school. Sleepy, unpretending Wolfenbüttel has the honour of being the cradle of the German stage. Here Elizabethan actors, knights of the new religion, shook their spears in the face of Teutonic ignorance, and colonised.

Here London "copper-laced Christians," as Henslowe calls them in his diary, fresh from the Finsbury and Bankside Green Fields, brought sweetness and light to the whole Germanic Continent. The licensed servants of Duke Heinrich Julius, the wisest, strongest, best Duke, perhaps, that Brunswick ever had, they were permitted, if not instructed, to stroll to all the principal Courts—Cassel, Brandenburg, Frankfort, Stuttgart, Nüremberg, and to Prague itself, helping to accomplish a work which would hardly have succeeded, as it did, without them. Heinrich Julius' interests and sympathies lay in the same direction as Francis St. Alban's; they both saw in the stage a means of reform and education, and the German philosopher's own private stage became a *Burg* within a *Burg*, a strong castle within a strong castle, for in his time the technical term for the platform where actors trod was *Burg*, or *Castle*, a survival of the name of one part of the *mise-en-scène* of a mediæval play.

Did Francis know Heinrich Julius to be the founder of a State? Did he know him to be planting a new colony? Did he know him as the father of the modern German drama? Did he? If he did not he must have been strangely ignorant of what was common Court gossip, common green-room gossip, for Heinrich Julius was the friend of James Stuart's youth, and his brother-in-law.

The present castle is of comparatively modern date. It is to *Heinrich der Jüngere*, Heinrich Julius' grandfather, that his picturesque pile, topped with minarets and towers, owed its erection.

A tournament arranged for the amusement of stranger Princes by Julius, in 1576, commenced the glories of Wolfenbüttel. Duke Julius was the Protestant son of vindictive and Catholic Heinrich, who forced his lame and delicate son to fly from his persecutions in early youth. Father and son eventually made friends over the cradle of Heinrich Julius, born at Cassel, in 1564.

When we bear in mind how few of his remarkable contemporaries Bacon mentions, we shall do well, I think, to mark those he does name, among whom we find Heinrich Julius,* who reigned in his father's stead in 1589.

He divided his favours between his palace at Prague, as the favourite and honoured counsellor of Rudolph II., and his ducal residence at Wolfenbüttel. Here he recruited soldiers and trained his peasants and retainers in the art of war. He is reported to have reigned with prodigal pomp and much commercial prosperity. Notwithstanding his troubles with his townsfolk, he, one of the foremost thinkers and philosophers of his day, found time for scientific research, especially as regards medicine; and, sharing with Bacon and Shakespeare, the opinion that the ills of the body are due in great measure to the ills of the mind, he consecrated his strong "*Burg*" to the amusement of large audiences, rich and poor, low and high, and thus spread joy and happiness as a practical cure for discontent and miseries of all kinds. He built the church which still stands, and began the erection of a school-house, interrupted by the plague.

His mother, Hedwig, was the great influence of his

* See October, 1902, *BACONIANA*, p. 188-9.

early life, and his education was of the best. At ten he carried on a theological disputation; at twelve he was already Rector of Helmsted, addressing a congregation in Latin, while he was as strong in Greek. Mathematics, chemistry, and natural philosophy were among his favourite studies, with architecture thrown in as a relaxation for his leisure moments. Roman law, which he affected most dearly of all, he kept as light reading when he travelled. In 1587 he sat as Court Judge at Gandersheim; two years afterwards he became duke. Married twice, it is his second wife, Princess Elizabeth of Denmark, who interests us. It is by his alliance with her he became uncle to Charles I. and Elizabeth of Bohemia. Bonds of true affection bound him to James I., whom he first met at Kronberg with his young bride during his own marriage festivities with her sister Elizabeth in 1590.

He was a romantic fellow, this German Duke, for he laid his heart at his royal lady's feet together with a chaplet of pearls, disguised as a merchant jeweller, and he only escaped whipping, if nothing worse, by discovering his identity. He seems to have been a many-sided man, for as one of his literary countrymen says:* "Though a lover of jurisprudence his first love did not shut out humanitarian studies, nor relative subjects and interests." He was a poet as well as everything else that nature, education, and industry made him, and besides possessing a passion for the new English drama, was himself a writer of plays. Before his day all dramatic representations were produced under the patronage, if not actually by the Church, under the walls of a Church or Monastery. This Prince, judge, philosopher, statesman, and playwright invited to his Court a company of English actors, well trained in their profession, under whose direction and tuition he was enabled to plant the

* Tittmann.

first roots of German Dramatic Art, which, taking firm hold, finds in the German theatre of to-day complete expression.

Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, in the end of 1585 included in his train which accompanied him to the Netherlands a company of English actors, trained professionals, musicians, and dancers, leapers and tumblers, among whom was Elizabeth's favourite, "Jesting Will." This man, William Kempe, the famous jig and Morris dancer, strolled on with others into Germany when Dudley returned to England.

In 1586 the King of Denmark received members of Leicester's theatrical company at his Court at Kronberg, and licensed them servants of his son the King of Saxony, Christian I. Among these five actors, whose goal was Wolfenbüttel, were Thomas Pope and George Bryan, both of whose names appear in the first folio as performers of the Shakespeare plays in company, with the less known player Shaxper. They seem to have been good dancers, though not so good as Will Kempe. They strolled to Wolfenbüttel, and are set down in their travelling licence as fiddlers and instrumentalists, whose duty it was to wait upon the Court as "springers," or agile dancers, having, as is added, attained to elegant perfection in their art.

In 1590 Julius erected for the first time a permanent stage in his Castle at Wolfenbüttel, probably with the co-operation of his young bride, Elizabeth, whose taste for theatricals seems to have been as formed as that of her sister, Queen Anne. It is suggested by German authors that the Duke's love for James may account for the attraction English plays and English actors had for him, and for his "*close relations with England.*"

In 1591 Lord Howard issued a pass-port and an introduction to the States-General for a company of four who desired to travel through Zealand, Holland and

Friesland to Germany. These were Robert Browne, John Bradstreet, whose name appears spelt a little differently in different entries, sometimes partaking of the German translation, *i.e.*, *Breitstrasse*, Thomas Saxfield (Sachevil), and Richard Jones. These are also designated as musicians, "springers," but particularly as actors ("*en fait de Jeux de comédies, tragédies, et histoires*"), who desired to act by the way and so defray expenses.

It is said that they were probably invited over by the Duke of Brunswick, and that taking root in Wolfenbüttel, they became the real founders of a new State.

Brown and Jones returned to London next year, but Sachevil lived and died in Wolfenbüttel, where his dwelling-places may still be seen. One at the corner of the quaint market-place is now part of a small shop, the other stands on the side of the Ochre, and part of it is the dwelling of a poor but courteous old man, who is ready to show his one room with surprise to any Baconian who cares to visit it, with the protest: "No Englishman has lived here since my time!"

Sachevil left the stage in 1617, and became a trader in English stuffs, a silk-mercator, who dealt in gloves, stockings and hats, and who was ever the "loved and trusted" friend of his Lord, Heinrich Julius. He seems to have been commonly known in the town as Jan or Johann *Bouset*, or *Bosset*, which was his great character, as far as we can judge. We have said that the Duke was a playwright, and his eleven plays were acted by the English actors at first by themselves, and later by those they had trained in their art. Sachevil took the part of the *Narr* or Clown, which some German authors think was decidedly taken from the Shakesperian Clown. He was so identified with this buffoon that when his servant's daughter died, she was notified as being of the

household of *Jan Bousset*—and this in the Church Register.

The entrance of this character set the audience in a roar, he was introduced into many of the Duke's plays, and played an important part in them too. Gluttinous, foolish, good-humoured, bucolic, he is akin to the old *Hans-wurz* of an earlier Germany, the typical clod-hopper of the Teutons, otherwise called *Eulenspiegel*.

Curiously enough, Luther mentions him in 1541.

He says, "The word *Hans-würz*, 'Ship of Fools' (*Narr-Schiff* in Low Saxon) is not mine, nor found by me, but is used by other people to designate the clumsy blockhead, the churl, who wants to be so clever and is yet so absurd in speech and action." Doubtless he was introduced to attract the "groundlings" and get them to listen to Shakespeare and better things, and by holding the mirror up to nature give the necessary impulse onward and upward. His name is a difficulty, what did it mean? What is its derivation? No one seems quite to know, even in Germany.

It had been suggested that it was "posset," the English word, pronounced as all this part was in a kind of Low Saxon, half-Dutch, half-German, half-English. Dr. Paul Zimmerman, who has written on these players, and from whom I received kind help when in Wolfenbüttel this summer, gives as a kind of explanation that a "posset" was made of milk-punch, without going as far as I am inclined to do. It may be possible that this thick-set, awkward "wort" or "knot-grass" was provided with a round-shouldered hump, and with his "*lustig*" manners, which word in the dictionary is given as "Boosy," may have been afterwards developed into our merry, rollicking "Punch." The word Posset, and the word, disagreeable as it is, Boosy, may be akin; while Bossy and *Bossive*, an obsolete word, may also be the origin for a name which would describe

his humpy figure? Conjecture all, but commendable to Wolfenbüttel's *literati*, as I was pleased to find.

The word in German for Bossive is *knötlich*, which reminds one how both Bacon and Shakespeare speak of knot-grass in contempt, and as a deformed thing.* It needs better soil to produce, in its stead, "Spire" grass.

Sachevil had another part to play for his friend and master, Heinrich Julius, and this was to *travel to England* and elsewhere *when he desired it*. It was specially "set down" in the charter signed under the Ducal seal. He was attached to the Court as "servant," which in those days meant actor, and was evidently held in confidence and esteem. He named his son after the Duke, who is therefore supposed to have been his god-father. There is a statement that he received in Frankfort, at the fair at Easter, in 1606, 180 thalers, which he "had given D. Foppio in England in exchange." This is not very understandable, but our interest is excited when we know that this said Foppio von Aitzema was living in England at that time, and entered into the Duke of Brunswick's service in 1616.

It only remains to ask with regard to this trusted servant of Heinrich Julius, to whom in England did he go on private messages, and why was an actor chosen as an Ambassador?

After Jones returned to England we find him figuring in Henslowe's diary as one of the Earl of Nottingham's servants, playing at the Rose on Bankside. It is worthy of notice that Germany, much as its interests are involved, declares positively that the player Shakspeare did not visit that country.

In 1592 the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse followed the example of his intimate friend the Duke of Brunswick,

* *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act III. Sc. ii., and "Natural History," p. 117.

† The Lord Admiral. Ship of Fools.

and his castle at Cassel became a centre too of dramatic life, himself the author of Comedies and Tragedies.*

Moritz was a foremost thinker of the day, a companion of Rudolf II., and of all "lovers" of the new learning. A correspondent of the Earl of Essex, and engaged in friendly courtesies and embassies with England, we are not surprised to hear of his building his theatre on the English plan. It was equipped with every property in vogue in England; flying machines, towers, clouds, trees, etc., while the cost of gold and silver lace, stuffs, plumes, fringes, weapons, and etceteras of all sorts is said to have been immense. The English actors may have been *exigéant* because he dismissed them the second year back to England, with the title of "cursed" actors, which sounds bad. But he had others in their stead, and these held themselves in readiness to produce stage plays when needed. Their salary included costumes, fire and lighting, board and lodging. It seems to have been the object of these advanced thinkers in Germany to introduce Shakespeare's plays there, and to have lightened that legitimate drama with interludes of dancing. The actor Bradstreet seems to have been a favourite master of that Art. He was appointed Court Dancing Master at Wolfenbüttel, and taught the Princely children foreign dances and graceful agility generally. He received his charter under the Duke's seal for this in December, 1603, and must have included among his pupils a hero of the Thirty Years' War, Christian of Helmsted, then four years old, and later the knightly champion of Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, his first cousin, whom Professor Rait in his "History of our Stuart Princesses," calls his distant cousin. His devoted romantic attachment to this lovely cousin makes Christian an object of much

* In 1611 his son Otto was fêted in England.

interest. Being the son of Heinrich Julius, one dares wonder whether, being trained and educated in the New Religion, he was not rather a lover of the true *Elizabeth*, whom at that time the best poets sung, and the deepest philosophers worshipped.

At a future date I hope to bring more interesting facts about Wolfenbüttel forward, under the title: "Wolfenbüttel and its Library;" for the present let us seek for answers to these questions:—

Did the Reformers of Learning in Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries join hands with the greatest Reformer of their age? and by means of that most popular of all arts, the Stage?

Were they working strictly on his lines, and scattering the good seed in Germany and Austria, fighting the good fight even to the coasts of Bohemia against *a sea of trouble*?

That all Germany was suddenly permeated with the ideas of the new learning which burst forth in Europe, like the warm rays of a rising sun, in the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, we know. Nothing is more likely than that the English actors who travelled from one German Court to another had more to do with this than we have hitherto fancied. That Francis Bacon pulled the strings which put the whole machinery into working order, I have little doubt. The means he used being the Secret Society of Rosicrucians, of which we have every reason to believe he was the Rex, the Emperor. This is certain, that all the German princes and dukes whose names have appeared in this article as possessing a stage of their own, and encouraging the representation of stage plays at their Courts, were members of a Secret Society of Philosophers, and were "noble lovers" of a Secret Chymistry and Physick, by which they hoped to achieve the Reformation of the Globe. Their aims were iden-

tical with their Invisible *King Physicorum*, the *Elias Artista*, whose coming as the Seventh Reformer of the world had been prophesied a century before by Theophrastus, and whose Divine wisdom was to effect a *Universal Reformation*. The date fixed for his coming was 1581 to 1590. When we remember that Bacon was then twenty to thirty years old, we ask ourselves, was this the Elias who was destined to usher in a new era of Divine Light? and was this accomplished by means of the stage? It has long been said that Shakespeare has done more than any other single writer to educate the world.

His most High and worthy Serene Highness His Imperial Majesty Rudolph II., the Lord and Prince Ernest Duke of Bavaria, and Kur-Furst of Cologne, Frederic Duke of Württemberg, His Highness Heinrich Julius Duke of Brunswick, His Highness Lord Prince Maurice Landgraf of Hesse, and other potentates of both spiritual and temporal standing, were all initiated, according to Semler, into the study of this higher medicine and earthly treasure of Secret Wisdom, and dispensed freely and benevolently their precious and valuable medicine, "especially possessing the Christlike humility denied to so many clever men," and not "disdaining to hold friendly intercourse with their new colonists, humble artists," on the subject of their mutual "secret." If this does not point to the English actors having their share in Rosicrucian Secrets, I am much mistaken.

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

Authorities: Herr Geheimrath v. Heinemann, Ducal Librarian of Wolfenbüttel; Dr. Paul Zimmerman, Editor of the "Brunswick Magazine," and author of "English Comedians in Wolfenbüttel;" Professor Tittmann's Edition of the Plays of Heinrich Julius, Duke of Brunswick, in "Deutsche Dichter, of the Sixteenth Century;" "History of the Rosicrucians," by D. Johann Salomo Semler (Leipzig, 1786).



Fig. 1. Imprint (Leyden, 1610).



Fig. 2. Imprint (Cologn).



Fig. 3. Head.



Fig. 5. Tailpiece (London, 1722).



Fig. 2. (Paris, 1682).



Fig. 3. Tailpiece (Geneva, 1628).



Fig. 4. Tailpiece (London, 1619).



Fig. 6. Tailpiece (Paris, 1650).



Fig. 7. Tailpiece (London, 1727).

HIDDEN SYMBOLS.

PART II.

"Emblem reduceth conceits intellectual to images sensible, which strike the memory more."—"Advancement of Learning."

MR. A. W. POLLARD in "*Old Picture Books*" notes the fact that "from 1490 onwards for twenty years we have a succession of woodcuts, which, amid all the differences that give them individuality, are yet closely linked together in style. . . . The suddenness with which they sprang up, the general similarity in style, and the nature of the books they illustrate, all suggest that *we have here to deal with a conscious and carefully directed movement, as opposed to the haphazard use of illustrations*" (p. 15).

As the words which I have italicised precisely express the points that it is my present endeavour to emphasize, I am taking the liberty of quoting them with a different purpose to that originally intended.

The peculiarities noted as existing for only "twenty" years persist well on into the 19th, if not into the 20th century. The one particular group of designs now reproduced is but a single type selected out of many.

As we have already seen, modern experts in bibliography cling with cheerful confidence to the fallacy that imprints upon title-pages are merely trade signs for the identification of the printers.

"Shorn of all romance and glamour which seem inevitably to surround every early phase of typographic art, a printer's device may be described as nothing more or less than a trademark."

—"Printers' Marks" (Roberts. London, 1893.)

But, as it is conceded that the meaning of these curious and complicated designs is at the present day

a complete mystery, it is permissible to suggest a possible interpretation, for, as Bacon says of the fables of antiquity, the fantastic absurdity of many of them "proclaims a parable."

If the reader will refer to *Fig. 1*, he will perceive that the design consists of a crab holding a butterfly. The meaning of this emblem, which is derived from the admitted source of so many of the Masonic "mysteries"—ancient Egypt—is *Festina lente* (make haste leisurely), the crab denoting *sloth* and the butterfly *speed*.

Fig. 2 is a combination of symbols, some of which I am unable to understand, but the Rosicrucian theory seems to explain many of them.

As we have now much evidence to prove, the aim of "Sublime Masonry"—in other words Rosicrucianism—was the universal reformation of the whole wide world, this reformation being attempted by the promulgation of good literature, but more especially by the educational influence of the *drama*. The contemporary literature of all Europe testifies to the sudden and astonishing outburst of dramatic art, and it is believed that Bacon, if he were not the actual soul of the movement, incontestably influenced the scheme of operations.

Accepting for one moment this theory, let us glance again at *Fig. 2*. The goats are presumably emblems of the drama, for the word "tragedy" is derived from two Greek words meaning "goat" and "song." "In ancient Greece the goat was sacred to the drama. At every performance at the theatre, actors and even members of the chorus, wore goat-skins."

The *cornucopiæ*, probably the most familiar of all Masonic emblems, denote unending and exhaustless plenty. The Sphere that is depicted between the goats probably denotes *universality*.

In *Fig. 3* we see almost precisely the same *ideas*

clothed in somewhat different symbolic characters. Instead of the crab the artist has introduced the cray-fish. That they both expressed the same meaning is plain from the following passage from a treatise entitled *Signes de nos pensées* (Costadau. Paris, 1717.):—

“Un papillon et un ecrivice (cray-fish) marquoient qu'il falloit se hâter lentement.” (Vol. II., p. 283.)

The meaning conveyed by the introduction of the snail is, in all probability, “slow but sure.”

“The slowest snail in time we see
Doth creep and climb aloft.”

—Robt. Greene, *Arbasto*.

The shaggy figure forming the centre of the design is undoubtedly PAN, the god of nature. Then, as now, Pan denoted and denotes *universality*.

The serpents at the foot of *Fig. 3* are, of course, the symbols of prudence and wisdom. Note how designedly they are arranged and entwined so as to read first as a double SS, *i.e.*, (S)ANCTUS (S)PIRITUS, and again as a triple SSS, *i.e.*, the three acclamations, (S)ANCTUS (S)ANCTUS (S)ANCTUS !

In *Fig. 4* we have a veritable speaking picture. At the first glance the reader will perceive our familiar but now dissevered friends, the crab and the butterfly. At the lower corners of the design appear two lamps, probably symbolising the lamp of knowledge, which it was the study of the Rosicrucians to keep trimmed and burning. Coiled into the form of the double SS we again note the serpent of wisdom. The plant upon which it is supported is the fabulous amaranth of the poets. This flower, which derives its name from two Greek words meaning not-decaying, was regarded as the symbol of never-fading immortality. Notwithstanding the nonsense that is written about Shakespeare warbling his native woodnotes wild, and growing immortal in his

own despite, Elizabethan writers very well knew that they were writing for all time and laying great bases for eternity.

"Not marble nor the gilded monuments of princes
Shall outlive this powerful rhyme."

—Shakespeare.

"This verse

Shall live, and surely *it shall live for ever* ;

For ever it shall live . . .

Such grace the Heavens do to my verses give."

—Spenser.

The foliage in *Fig. 3* is also that of the unfading amaranth.

On either side of the central figure in *Fig. 4* the reader will be gratified to recognise the familiar pillars of Freemasonry, JACHIN and BOAZ. The three female figures playing upon instruments denote, I think, PHILOSOPHY and her handmaids, POETRY and MUSIC, playing upon the human soul. This suggestion is somewhat conjectural, but if the reader will have the patience to follow a little further I am in hopes he may acquiesce in the interpretation.

Bacon, of course, regarded Philosophy as a means to tune the discords of this jarring world and draw the music from men's souls. In the grounds of his house at Gorhambury he erected a statue to the musician Orpheus and inscribed it "PHILOSOPHY PERSONIFIED." Hence Music was in his mind evidently analogous with Philosophy.

In "*The Wisdom of the Ancients*" "the meaning of this fable," says Bacon, "seems to be thus :—Orpheus' music is of two sorts . . . the first may be fitly applied to natural philosophy, the second to moral or civil discipline. Philosophy . . . by persuasion and eloquence insinuating the love of virtue, equity and concord in the mind of man draws multitudes of men to a society,

makes them subject to laws, obedient to government, and forgetful of their unbridled affections."

Now Bacon had the keenness of a boring tool. He knew better than anyone that "*reading good books of morality is a little flat and dead*" (Essay on "*Friendship*"), and that in order to insinuate moral precepts into the average mind one must gild the pill. As Sir Philip Sidney observes, in "*The Defence of Poesie*" :

"Truly neither philosopher nor historian could at the first have entered into the gates of popular judgment if they had not taken a great disport in *poetry*. . . . *The philosophers of Greece durst not a long time appear to the world but under the masks of poets*. So Thales, Empedocles, and Parmenides sang their natural philosophy in verse. So did Pythagoras and Phocylides their moral counsels."

Poetry has been happily defined as harmonious wisdom, or impassioned philosophy. As a *second* aid to insinuate "the sweet food of sweetly uttered knowledge" Bacon instinctively recognised MUSIC. In "*The Advancement of Learning*" we find him writing :

"Poesy checreth and refresheth the soul, chanting things rare and various and full of vicissitudes. . . . *Joined also with consort of music* whereby it may more sweetly insinuate itself, it hath won such success that it has been in estimation even in rude times and barbarous nations, when other learning stood excluded."

In "*The Defence of Poesie*" there is an absolutely beautiful passage to the same effect :

"He (the poet) beginneth not with obscure definitions, which must blur the margent with interpretations, and load the memory with doubtfulness; but he cometh to you with words set in delightful proportion, either accompanied with, or prepared for the well-inchanting skill of musicke; and with a tale forsooth he cometh unto you, with a tale which holdeth children from play, and old men from the chimney corner; and, pretending no more, doth intende the winning of the mind from wickednesse

to vertue ; even as the childe is often brought to take most wholsom things, by hiding them in such other as have a pleasant taste."

The instruments upon which the three figures in our speaking picture are playing, are, I think, intended to represent the souls of mankind.

In the Invocation to Book I. of "*Emblems Divine and Moral*" (edition 1736), Francis Quarles writes:—

"Rouse thee, my soul, and drain thee from the dregs
Of vulgar thoughts ; screw up the heightened pegs
Of thy sublime Theorbo four notes higher,
And high'r yet, that so the shrill-mouth'd choir
Of swift-winged seraphims may come and join,
And make the concert more than half divine."

The idea that a man is a stringed instrument, of which his faculties and senses are the strings, was undoubtedly held by Bacon and many contemporaries. "You are a fair viol," says Shakespeare, "and *your sense the strings.*" (*Pericles* I. i.).

Massinger, in *A Very Woman* (IV. i.), writes :

"Every soul's alike a musical instrument,
The *faculties* in all men equal *strings.*"

Lyly, in *Love's Metamorphosis* (III. i.) says :

"The strings of my heart are tuned. . . . There is no base string in a woman's heart."

Marston, in *The Insatiate Countess* (I. i.) writes :

"Thou art like the bass viol in a concert. Let the other instruments wish and delight in your highest sense thou art still grumbling."

In *Menaphon*, Robert Greene uses the same simile :

"How fair she is that makes thy music mount,
And every string of thy heart's harp to move."

In "*The Advancement of Learning*," Bacon writes :

"The poets did well to conjoin music and medicine in Apollo, because the office of medicine is but to tune this curious harp of man's body and reduce it to harmony.

Here Bacon, in all probability, uses the term *medicine* with the further metaphorical meaning of medicine for a mind diseased. It will be remembered, the leading Rosicrucian rule was "To cure the sick gratis," *i.e.*, the *mentally* sick.

Having thus established a probability that the three figures represent Philosophy, Music and Poetry, and that the instruments upon which they are playing denote the human mind, it only remains to point out the remarkable fact, that Bacon likened *the Drama* to the *bow of a violin*. Here is the passage :

"Dramatic poetry, which has the theatre for its world, would be of excellent use if it were sound, for the discipline and corruption of the theatre is of very great consequence. And the corruptions of this kind are numerous in our times, but the regulation quite neglected. The action of the theatre, though modern states esteem it but ludicrous, unless it be satirical and biting, was carefully watched by the ancients, that it might improve mankind in virtue, and *indeed many wise men have thought it to the mind as the bow to the fiddle.*"

—*Advancement of Learning.*

I should be exceedingly sorry to appear to wish to force a fanciful or unjustifiable interpretation upon these hieroglyphic pictures, but it can scarcely be contended that they are merely conventional ornaments; and, if they possess any hidden meaning whatever, it seems unlikely that a key which unlocks and opens so many doors can be otherwise than the master key. The Rosicrucian theory is so staggering that it will be a matter of time before it will be possible to win for it wide attention.

"It makes the course of thoughts to fetch about,
Startles and frights consideration,
Makes sound opinion sick and truth suspected."

The orthodox Shakespearean creed is brought out into clear prominence by Mr. Sidney Lee, who asserts that Shakespeare's highest ambition was to earn a modest competence, and restore the faded—sadly faded—family repute.

"Pope had just warrant for the surmise that he (Shakespeare)

' For gain, not glory, winged his roving flight,
And grew immortal in his own despite.'"

—*Life of Shakespeare* (Lee).

On the other hand, we Baconian heretics are probably not very wide of the mark, when we assert that Francis Bacon, the master musician, who at the age of 15, planned a new philosophy, who in later years wrote that he had "*vast contemplative ends*," that "*philanthropia was so fixed in his mind that it could not be moved*," and that he had "*taken all knowledge*" to be his "*province*," deliberately composed his music for the reformation of the world, and has ever since, with the assistance of an orchestra of selected followers, been playing upon men's souls. That this Orchestra is to be identified with Sublime Masonry is, I think, now scarcely open to doubt. We have tangible proofs before us of the existence until very recently, if not until to-day, of a conscious and carefully directed movement at work, at all events in *literature*. Let the reader look carefully into figure 5. He will perceive, secreted among the contents of a "conventional" tail-piece, the snail, the butterfly, and the serpent. I cannot believe that this is due to chance, nor can I credit that the snail, the butterfly and the serpent, as they reappear in figs. 6 and 7, are "conventional renaissance ornaments."

HAROLD BAYLEY.

ENGLISH HISTORY ON THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE.

READERS of the "*Faerie Queene*" will observe how the poem is made the vehicle of much instruction in various subjects. English history in the early days is, for instance, imparted in very easy form in Book II., Canto 10.

Whether by accident, fashion, or the scheme of some master mind anxious to teach in an acceptable way, British history was at this period (1584 to 1631) also extensively exhibited in stage plays.

The times of Brute and Locrine in the Play of *Locrine*, of Leir in *King Lear*, of Archigallus and Elidurus in *Nobody and Somebody*, of Cassibelane in *True Trojans*, of Kimbeline in *Cymbeline*, of Marius in *Wounds of Civil War*, of Boadicea in *Bonduca*, of Vortigern, Hengist and Horsa in *Mayor of Quinborough*, of Uter Pendragon in *Birth of Merlin*, and of Arthur in *Misfortunes of Arthur* are in this form illustrated.

Then comes a notable break, and the history Plays pass to the period beginning with the Norman Conquest.

William I. appears in *Faire Emn*, Henry I. in *Famous Wars*. *Stephen* is the title of a lost Play. Then we have Richard I. in *Downfall of Huntingdon*, John in *King John*, Henry III. in *Bacon and Bungay*.

After these follow a sequence of Plays of *Edward I.*, *Edward II.*, *Edward III.*, *Richard II.*, *Henry IV.*, *Henry V.*, and *Henry VI.* Edward IV. is introduced in *Pinner of Wakefield*, *Edward V.*, *Richard III.*, Henry VII. in *Perkin Warbeck*, *Henry VIII.*, and finally the times of Edward VI. and Mary in *Sir Thomas Wyatt*. It can almost be said that no two authors deal with the same historical period.

Two of above Plays were printed after the dates men-

tioned, though doubtless written much earlier. I refer to *Birth of Merlin* and to *Mayor of Quinborough*. The latter and *Nobody and Somebody* have titles germane only to their clownish subplots which supplanted earlier and more correct titles.

OTHER CURIOUS FACTS.

1. All Plays printed from 1584 until 1594 were anonymously published.

2. No Play was title-paged to either Marlowe, Greene, Kyd or Peele until after his death.

Old Wives' Tale, 1595, with the initials of "G. P." may be an exception, but as the year did not expire until March 25th, and Peele was last heard of on the previous January 17th, seriously ill and destitute, he may have been dead at the date of publication.

P. W.

THE TITLE-PAGE OF "HENRY VII."

THE interpretation that Mr. Mallock places upon this obviously symbolic title-page has been challenged by Father Thurston, who points out the Civil strife of the reign of Henry VII. and the many attempts made to influence Fortune during the period.

A simpler and more convincing explanation is fairly apparent.

The central figure is almost undoubtedly Fortune. Fortune flies, and this lady is provided with wings. Fortune stands on a notoriously insecure foundation, and this lady is depicted as standing upon a ball. The lock of hair signifies that Fortune must be grasped boldly from the front, and is very characteristic; so again is the wheel, the best known of Fortune's

emblems. Mr. Mallock's interpretation of the bridle (Fame) is a good one, and the other emblem is probably Fortune's Cup, a well-known property. Fortune holds fame in her hand, and poison or life in her cup.

But the particular application of the plate to the book it adorns is more convincing.

The life of King Henry VII. was remarkable for the fluctuations of fortune; from power to exile, from exile to a throne. His reign (and it is the reign only that is dealt with in the book) is chiefly remarkable for the many attempts made to upset him. By a combination of wisdom and courage, or statesmanship and force of arms, he succeeded in holding his position, and died in possession of the Crown.

The philosopher-like figure, therefore, in all probability represents good counsel or wisdom, and the military figure courage or force of arms.

It will be noticed that the right hand pair of figures between them have inserted a staff in such a way as to prevent Fortune turning her wheel, *and the kingly crown is on the top*. In vulgar parlance, they have put a spoke in her wheel.

The emblems on the wheel are curious. Mr. Mallock explains the lower ones thus: "The jester's bells, a bowl (of doubtful origin), the rod for the fool's back, and the mirror that is held up to nature."

One is tempted to hazard the suggestion that the "rod" is probably the well-known potscourer (in daily use in our sculleries), the bowl, a kitchen utensil, and the "mirror," more probably a tasting-spoon.

They will then stand as emblems of King Henry's defeated rival, Lambert Simnel, who was condemned to serve as a scullion in the Royal kitchen.

THE CANONBURY INSCRIPTION.

AS the Baconian cause is not assisted, but the contrary, when fallacious points are offered to the public in support of it, just as a good case is sometimes prejudiced by the support of a witness who proves on cross-examination to be untrustworthy, I venture to think that I am doing a useful service in drawing attention to a mistaken point in Mr. Mallock's article in the *Pall Mall Magazine* for January.

Mr. Mallock states as a fact that a part of the inscription in Canonbury Tower runs: "REGINA MARIA ELIZABETHA SOROR: SUCCEDIT FR. . . . JACOBUS," and puts this forward in support of the theory of Bacon's belief in his royal birth; asking what the mutilated word can stand for unless for Francis.

It will be seen, however, by any one who makes a careful inspection of the inscription that the word does not begin with F, but with E, and I can make a suggestion instead of Francis that I think will be considered satisfactory.

By the courtesy of the present occupiers of the Tower, I was permitted to see the inscription on two occasions about ten months ago. As it is inconveniently situated, high up on the wall of a not too well lighted landing, I provided myself with an electric lamp, which I was able, standing on a chair, to hold close to the letters, and I have no hesitation in saying that the first letter of the word is E.

How, then, came Nelson to give it as F, in 1811, in his *History of Islington*? I think the explanation is that it was characteristic of the handiwork of the painter of the inscription to make the upper horizontal stroke of his E decidedly stronger and more conspicuous than the lower one, which, besides being thinner than the upper one, is not continuous, and does

not join on to the vertical stroke. To the right of the bottom end of the vertical stroke there is first a blank space, then a light horizontal stroke, then another blank space, and then the tick at the end, the tick itself being weaker than the tick to the upper horizontal. It will appear on examination of the painter's other E's, that these peculiarities were habitual with him. The result of them is that the E might at first sight be taken for an F, especially in a bad light.

My conjecture, as to what the word really was, is that it was EAMQ., Q. standing for QUE, as it does in other parts of the inscription. The few traces that remain of the letters following the E, seem consistent with the word having been EAMQ. Substituting EAMQ. for Nelson's Fr—, and giving the whole inscription, to enable an opinion to be formed as to how EAMQ. suits the general style and tenor of the lines, we have:—

WILL. CON. WILL. RUFUS. HEN. STEPHANUS.

HENQ. SECUNDUS.

RI. JOHN. HEN. TERT. ED. TERNI. RIQ. SECUNDUS.

HEN. TRES. ED. BINI. RI. TERNUS. SEPTIMUS.

HENRY.

OCTAVUS. POST. HUNC. EDW. SEXT. REGINA. MARIA.

ELIZABETHA. SOROR. SUCCEDIT. EAMQ. JACOBUS.

SUBSEQUITUR. CHAROLUS. QUI. LONGO. TEMPORE.

VIVAT !

The sense runs very well—"Elizabeth her sister follows Mary and James follows her." Could anything be simpler or more natural ?

G. B. ROSHER.

WE have set it down as a law to ourselves to examine things to the bottom, and not to receive upon credit or reject upon improbabilities until there have been passed a due examination.—*Francis Bacon.*

FRANCIS BACON, AND HIS KNOWLEDGE OF FIELD-SPORTS.

IN 1897, a book was published which gained from Baconians less attention than it deserves—"The Diary of Master William Silence: A Study of Shakespeare and Elizabethan Sport."* The present pages do not pretend to review this very readable and thorough work, the most complete on the subjects of which it treats, and heartily to be recommended to lovers of Field-Sports and of Shakespeare. There are, however, points in this book to which students of "Bacon" *plus* "Shakespeare" must take exception: unwarrantable assertions or insinuations against *Bacon*, needless dragging-in of his name, and apparent efforts to depress him in order to exalt his supposed rival. This perpetual pitting of one against the other may be part of what seems to be a growing desire to keep the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy stirring and before the eyes of the public. We love not controversy, and confess that adverse criticisms are made with the less compunction, because an idea has possessed us that the distinguished author with whom we have to do is not without a sense of humour, and that beneath the wig and gravity of a Vice-Chancellor, he is poking fun at those who plume themselves upon having studied one side only of our vast and many-sided question.

To begin with a passage on p. 222, where all the points enumerated may be found illustrated. After several pages on the picturesque and unique language of Falconry, and its use by *Sir Philip Sidney*, *Spenser*, *Drayton*, *Greene*, *Fletcher*, *Kyd*, *Massinger*, *Marlowe*, and

* By the Right Hon. D. H. Madden, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin. (Longmans.)

Ben Jonson, an epigram is quoted, addressed to Sir Henry Goodyere * To him *Ben Jonson* writes :—

Goodyere, I'm glad and grateful to report
 Myself a witness of thy few days' sport ;
 Where I both learn'd why wise men hawking follow,
 And why that bird was sacred to Apollo.
 She doth instruct men by her gallant flight
 That they to knowledge so should tower upright,
 And never stoop but strike to ignorance ;
 Which if they miss, yet they should re-advance
 To former height, and there in circle tarry
 Till they be sure to make the fool their Quarry. †

“ Who,” asks our author, “ were these wise men, whose love of hawking amazed Ben Jonson? I know of one ‡ who in all respects answers the description ; that wise man, namely, of whom Jonson wrote in his “ *Discoveries*,” “ I loved the man, and do honour his memory, on this side idolatry, as much as any.” (*Now comes the contrast.*) “ There was indeed, in the Elizabethan age, another man of transcendent genius, also well-known to Jonson § and who happened to be a man of birth and breeding, but who differed from his fellows in his attitude towards the sports and pastimes of the day, and in whose mind the allusions collected in these pages would have excited no emotion, unless it were one of distaste. When Francis Bacon took all knowledge for his province, his *omne scibile* comprehended none of the mysteries in which the writer of these passages found unceasing delight.” The writer then goes on to explain why this defect in Bacon is not to be wondered at, and to these further assumptions we will presently return.

* Gentleman of the King's Privy Chamber, Patron of *Drayton*, and eulogised by *Camden*. † Epig. 85. ‡ “ *Shakespeare*.”

§ *Jonson* (whose name was *Johnson*) was one of Bacon's “ able pens,” and wrote the Apologie for “ *Barth : Fair*” under is roof.

First, however, *is it a fact* that Francis Bacon had no sympathy with, or comprehension of the "mysteries" of Field Sports? Surely it is no fact, but a mere blind, or an assumption, based upon incomplete knowledge.

Most of us know that the last book but one of the "*Novum Organum*" consists of a brief sketch of a Natural and Experimental History, or *Parasceve*, which he regarded as fundamental and indispensable—the one real novelty which distinguished his philosophy from that of his contemporaries; *the* novelty from which the most important results were to be expected. Much discussion has taken place as to *Bacon's* precise intention in inaugurating this great work of collecting facts, and establishing them by experiments; but without puzzling ourselves with long words and arguments, we are able to perceive that in days ignorant, often misinformed, but still self-satisfied, he was resolving to raze the shaky fabric of learning, which he repeatedly said had degenerated into a pedantic system of teaching, "words, not matter," and in place of this, he would rear a "New Temple of Solomon," a "House of the Seven Days," a "Palace of Truth," perfect and furnished in every department.

Now in order to arrive at true "generals," accurate conclusions, it is necessary to collect "particulars." In other words, *Inductive* must precede *Deductive* Philosophy.* The immediate outcome of *Bacon's* convictions on this head was the compilation of "*A Catalogue of Particular Histories*," seldom seen in print, but of extraordinary interest. It includes 130 "*Histories*," arranged in groups "by titles," and

* It is the practice of "*Bacon's*" biographers to represent him as the "Inductive Philosopher" only. Francis St. Alban did not stop at Induction, though his Deductive Philosophy goes still under other names.

include the "*History of the Heavenly Bodies*;" "*Histories of the Greater Masses*;" "*Histories of Species*," and "*Histories of Man*"

It is with the last (and most voluminous) that we have to do. Beginning with the Figure and Limbs of Man, the catalogue passes to Physiognomy, Anatomy, the Faculties, the Ages of Man, Medicine, Surgery, the Senses, the Fine Arts, and almost every conceivable Art or Craft affecting the Mind and Body of Man, until they reach his out-door life and exercises. The proposed works are *deficient*, we observe, and our universal Encyclopedist has found nothing deficient which he has not endeavoured to supply, "*although of himself he is silent.*" Amongst these deficiencies, then, we find the following:—

117. "*History of Fishing.*"

118. "*History of Hunting and Fowling.*"

121. "*History of Athletics*," and Human Exercises of all kinds.

122. "*History of Horsemanship.*"

123. "*History of Games of all kinds.*"

Can any one, after reading this comprehensive list, agree with our author that the *omne scibile* of Francis Bacon comprehended none of the "mysteries" of Field Sport? We think not, and it may be an interesting pursuit for some happy possessor of old books of venerie and woodcraft, to hunt out and identify the books which Francis wrote or edited to supply the required "Histories." The earliest English work known on Falconry bears the title of "*Boke of St. Albans*," published 1486. Between that date and Shakespeare's death in 1616, it was, as Vice-Chancellor Madden duly records, "reprinted in whole or in part, more or less altered, no fewer than twenty-two times."

No hint is given as to the expert hand which undertook these revisions, nor when they began.*

* Students may compare of Faulconry, "*The Institution of a Gentleman*," 1555, 1568, "*Book of Faulconrie*," 1575, 1611, and

But we pass on to another objection, and ask upon what evidence does our well-read author put forth the statement that the sporting allusions collected in his pages from the works of many great writers of the 16th and 17th centuries, "*would have excited* (in Francis Bacon) no emotion, unless it were one of distaste?" Was the remark made with the object of keeping up the false but popular notion of Francis St. Alban as a cold, dry, ponderous, unemotional Lawyer and Philosopher—a man always old and staid, ceremonious and stiff, one holding himself aloof from common-place human sympathy, and from young-mannish "toys," such as hunting and hawking, dogs and horses.

This is not the place for a dissertation upon the character of Francis St. Alban, well enough known to most of us by the loving records left to us by his contemporaries; but we would have novices in this study, pause for a minute and try to realise the fact that he was really *not* born in a full-bottomed wig; that before he became Chancellor he had passed through at least five of the ages of man and had experienced many and great vicissitudes. Bred in the Courts of England and France, his childhood and youth had witnessed all the gaiety, the revelries, sports, and pastimes of which we read in the pages of Sully, and other memoirs of the time. *Is it possible* that he should not have seen re-

"*The Noble Arte of Venerie.*" Both attributed to Turberville, but the *Venerie* to others also. "*Latham's Falconry,*" 1615, "*Bert's Hawkes and Hawking,*" 1619. Sir D. H. Madden also extracts from Mr. Huth's Index the titles of 26 books on "*Horses and Equitation,*" written in the time of *Shakespeare*, and several more on Fishing and Angling. "No wonder," he says, "that Burton exclaims at the world of books, . . . on riding of horses, fencing, swimming, . . . faulconry, hunting, fishing, fowling, . . . all sorts of games, and what not?" p. 367. And yet Francis Bacon includes these subjects in his "*Catalogue of Historics,*" *to be written!*

peatedly and under varied conditions the sports which were not only national and social, but courtly, and as it were a part of State ceremonials and entertainments?

"It is quite as much a matter of course," says Sir D. H. Madden, "for Robert Shallow and his ancestors to keep a kennel of hounds as to write themselves 'Armigers' in any bill, warrant, quittance, or obligation;" he goes on to picture the fishing, fowling, coursing, and hunting which doubtless went on in the parks. Justice Shallow, concluding thus: "What could Master Slender do for the Justice but look after his hounds and his hawks? Such a hanger-on was a recognised part of the establishment of an old-fashioned country gentleman." Now this particular old country Justice is believed to be a prototype of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote Park, where Shaksper poached and killed the deer, and Sir Thomas himself was a connection by marriage of the Cooke family, of whom Lady Anne Bacon, the (adopted?) mother of Francis was a member. In the memorandum book, or "*Transportata*," of Francis is a note (July 25, 1608) of sureties in case of "*borrowing upon any great disbursements—My Cos. Cook.*" To this Spedding appends a foot-note:—"My Cos. Cook. Probably Sir William Cook, one of the Giddy Hall family,* who married Joyce Lucy, only surviving issue of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote, by his first marriage, and heiress of Hynam, in Gloucestershire."†

A letter from "Bacon" to Sir T. Lucy is extant, congratulating him upon the engagement of his daughter to "a gentleman bred to all honesty, virtue, and worth, with an estate convenient." He wishes

* Lady Anne Bacon's family.

† Spedding's *Let.*, I. iv 40. Hynam seems to be the Eignam of which "*Montaigne*" speaks as the home of some of his English relations.

that he were himself so fortunate in the Queen's service as "that there should be left as great an house of the Cookes in this gentleman, as in your good friend Mr. Attorney-General."*

Sir William Cooke, then, a kinsman of Lady Anne Bacon, married the grand-daughter of that Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlote, who has been considered to be the model for Justice Shallow.† It is this Sir Thomas Lucy who is said to have been lampooned in vile doggerel by William Shaksper, whom he caused to be whipped, set in the stocks, and finally driven from Stratford. When so much is made of "*Shakespeare's*" acquaintance with the neighbourhood of Stratford-on-Avon, and in general with the hunting districts of Warwickshire, Gloucestershire, and the Cotswolds, it is also well to remember that *Bacon* married Alice Barnham, step-daughter of the Worcestershire baronet, Sir John Packington, whose beautiful estate of Hampton Lovet (within easy touch of Stratford and of the Malvern and Cotswold region) was actually her home when *Bacon* "went a-courting" into the family.‡

This has been a digression; we return to our text and insist not only that *Bacon* did consider and study the particulars connected with Field Sports and "exercises of all kinds," but that the very air of the times which he breathed would have made it impossible for him as a gentleman and courtier to have known less on these subjects than even a poacher or deer-stealer from Stratford. "Three hundred years ago 'small Latin' was not more fatal to the reputation of a scholar than was ignorance of the language of Falconry to the

* Sir Edward Coke, or Cook, who treated Francis so badly.

† See Spedding's *Lct.* (L. ii. 369). N.B.—In the Index this entry has the page number falsely printed 309.

‡ See "*The Story of Bacon's Life*," and "*Personal History of Bacon*" (Hepworth Dixon).

character of a gentleman. To 'speak the hawking language' was, according to Ben Jonson, affected by those 'newer men' who apt the manners of the older gentry." Not the gentry alone, but see how Royalty also affected the field-sports to which *Shakespeare* so frequently alludes.

In 1578, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, writing to Lord Burleigh from a house supposed to be Grafton, says, "I think she never came to a place in her life she likes better, or commends more. . . . By-and-bye her Majy. is going to the forest to kill some bucks with her bow, as she hath done in the park this morning."* Again, during her famous visit at Kenilworth:—"Monday was so hot that her Majy. kept within till five in the evening, what time it pleased her to hunt the deer of forse."† On the following Wednesday "the Queen hunted the hart of *forse*; in this chase the deer took to the pool, where he was caught alive, and Her Majesty granted him his life on condition that he lost his ears for a ransom." Miss Strickland comments upon this "useless cruelty" aptly preceding the bear-baiting of the next day, when the virgin queen had the satisfaction of seeing some great ban-dogs, tied in the outer court, let loose on thirteen bears that were baited in the inner; where, says Laneham, such a "plucking and tugging, scratching and biting, and such an expense of blood and leather between them, as a month's licking, I ween, will not recover."‡

(To be concluded).

* Wright's "*Elizabeth and her Times*."

† i.e., Not "parked" but in open country. See Gascoigne's "*Princely Pleasures of Kenilworth*."

‡ Laneham's "*Kenilworth*."

BACON AT TWICKENHAM.

IN "Notes and Queries" of the January, 1903, number of *BACONIANA*, "A. B." asks when and why Bacon resided at Twickenham Park.* Spedding states (*"Letters and Life of Francis Bacon"*) that while Francis and Anthony were living together at Gray's Inn, in 1592, it was only now and then the brothers had occasion to communicate by letter "as when one of them visited his mother at Gorhambury, or retreated for quiet and fresh air to Twickenham Park, where Francis had a lodge." In August of that year, (upon a flying report of the sickness), Francis "betook himself, along with some of his lawyer friends, to Twickenham Park," after inviting Dr. Andrews, afterwards the famous Bishop, to join the party. While there, on the 14th of that August, he wrote and invited Thomas Phillips, who was employed by Essex, upon Bacon's recommendation, in procuring intelligence abroad for the Earl, to visit him. Essex was striving to be appointed councillor, and the times were rife with conspiracies involving the Jesuits and seminary priests and a new "plot of invasions between Spain, Scotland and the Pope," and on the 15th of the following September Francis wrote Phillips again the following mysterious letter :—

To Mr. Thomas Phillips.

SIR,—I congratulate your return, hoping that all is passed on your side. Your Mercury is returned ; whose return alarmed us upon some great matter, which I fear he will not satisfy. News of his coming came before his own letter, and to other than to his proper servant, which maketh me desirous to satisfy or to salve. My Lord hath required him to repair to me ; which upon his Lordship's and mine own letters received, I doubt not but he will with all speed perform ; where I pray you to meet him

* The question was of the hamlet *Whilton*, not Twickenham Park or Lodge. This question of "A. B." is left untouched.—ED.

if you may, that laying our heads together we may maintain his credit, satisfy my Lord's expectation, and procure some good service. I pray the rather spare not your travail, because I think the Queen is already party to the advertisement of his coming over, and in some suspect which you may not disclose to him. So I wish you as myself, this 15th of September, 1592.

Yours ever assured,

FR. BACON.

(Note the word "salve" above, and the line of the Sonnets—

"For no man well of such a *salve* can speak.")

In February, 1593, Bacon was preparing "to retire to Twickenham for the vacation (which began on the 13th of February and lasted till the 17th of April)". On the 25th of January, 1594, he wrote to Anthony "from my lodge at Twickenham Park," suggesting plans for his brother's advancement with the Queen after Francis had failed to secure the Solicitorship for himself. He was evidently disgusted with the Court, and determined to devote himself to his literary pursuits, for he says in this letter :—

For I must now be more careful of my credit than ever, since I received so little assistance thence where I deserved best. And to be plain with you, I mean even to make the best of *those small things* I have with as much expedition as may be without loss ; and so sing a mass of requiem I hope *abroad* ; for I know her Majesty's nature that she neither careth though the whole surname of the Bacons travelled, nor of the Cecils neither.

Now, what were the "small things" which he was going to make "the best of?" He was evidently deep in literary work of some character with "good pens" to assist him, for he continues :—

I have here an idle pen or two, specially one that was cozened, thinking to have gotten some money this term. I pray send me somewhat else for them to write out besides your Irish collection, which is almost done. There is a collection of Dr. James of foreign states, largeliest of Flanders, which, though it be no great matter, yet I would be glad to have it.

At this time Bacon was at Twickenham, evidently in retirement under the Queen's displeasure, who had refused to permit him personal attendance at Court to

urge his desire to travel abroad, for in a letter to Anthony he says, with a melancholy and semi-humourous irony:—

For that I was not an impudent man that could face out disgrace; and that I hoped her Majesty would not be offended, if not being able to endure the sun I fled into the shade.

In the same spring he wrote to Faulk Greville the famous letter in which he compares himself to a “piece of stuff bespoke in the shop,” and intimated that if the Queen did not take him he would sell himself “by parcels.” He was evidently not pining away at Twickenham, for Anthony saw him in March, and reported to Lady Bacon that he had “not seen him looking better.”

In May, 1595, Francis again retired to Twickenham Lodge, with fresh discouragement over the Solicitorship, and feeling like a man “enlarged from some restraint;” and on the 14th of October, after the Queen had made Fleming Solicitor-General, he writes the Lord Keeper, Puckering,—“If I had been an ambitious man, it would have overthrown me.” The land given by Essex to Bacon is thought to have joined the latter’s lodge, but “he continued to reside at Twickenham Park as before.”

The reason why Bacon was at Twickenham thus fairly appears. It was evidently his retreat, where he enjoyed the “sessions of sweet silent thought,” when he was “in disgrace with fortune and men’s eyes.” Then it was he probably wrote the lines addressed to his genius, figured by the elder Cupid, the god of creative art:—

“For thy sweet love remembered such welth brings,
That then I skorn to change my state with kings.”

“But if the while I think on thee (deare friend),
All losses are restored, and sorrows end.”

F. C. HUNT.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

BISMARCK A BACONIAN.

PRINCE BISMARCK appears to have been a Baconian convert. The following is clipped from *The Spectator's* critique of Mr. Sidney Whitman's recently published "Latter Days of Bismarck."

"On the new Shakespeare-Bacon theory his mind was open: he said, 'After all, there may be something in it,' adding, however, that the cypher theories were nonsense:—

"He did not pretend to any special knowledge, but he said that he could not understand how it were possible that a man, however gifted with the intuition of genius, could have written what was attributed to Shakespeare, unless he had been in touch with the great affairs of State, behind the scenes of political life, and also intimate with all the social courtesies and refinements of thought, which, in Shakespeare's time, were only to be met with in the highest circles. It also seemed to Prince Bismarck incredible that a man who had written the greatest dramas in the world's literature could, of his own free will, whilst still in the prime of life have retired to such a place as Stratford-on-Avon, and lived for years cut off from intellectual society and out of touch with the world."

This is a notable utterance, and we are rather surprised that Mr. Edmund Gosse has not embraced the opportunity to write to *The Times* and reiterate his astonishing theory that no one outside the professional literary clique has any business to express an opinion upon literary subjects.

DULCIS MUSA (BACONE)!

WE are indebted to Mr. Emil Weidlich for directing our attention to the following fact:

There is in the British Museum a small volume:
"Tho. Campiani Epigrammatum Libri II., Londini,

1619," which contains in the first book (epigram 190) the following lines:—

Ad ampliss. totius Angliæ cancellarium.

FR. BA.

Quantus ades, seu te spinosa volumina juris
Seu schola, seu *dulcis Musa* (Bacone) vocat !
Quam super ingenti tua re Prudentia regnat !
Et tota aethereo nectare lingua madens !
Quam bene cum tacita nectis gravitate lepores !
Quam semel admissis stat tuus almus amor !

[TRANSLATION.]

How great standest thou before us, whether the thorny volumes
of the Law, or the Academy, or the *sweet Muse* call thee
(O Bacon).

How thy Prudence governs great things !

And the whole tongue is moist with celestial nectar !

How well thou combinest merry wit with silent gravity !

How firmly thy kind love stands to those whom thou hast once
admitted.

Mr. A. H. Bullen, mentioning this epigram in the introduction to his "*Works of Dr. Thomas Campion*" (1889), writes:—"To Bacon's learning, eloquence, and munificence, Campion paid a worthy tribute," ignoring "*the sweet Muse*" altogether ! It is material to note that Campion was a renowned poet and a contemporary of Bacon.

His evidence is important, as it strengthens and confirms testimony from other sources. In the preceding issue of *BACONIANA*, we quoted from one of the contemporary writers of the "*Manes Verulamiani*" the expression, "Honey sweet wine" . . . This, Dr. Campion anticipates by "celestial nectar."

Ben Jonson's familiar testimony that Bacon's speech "*when he could spare or pass by a jest was nobly censorious,*" is paralleled by the line, "How well thou combinest merry wit with silent gravity."

The conclusion of Dr. Campion's epigram is endorsed by practically every one of Bacon's contemporaries ; for as Aubrey said, "All who were great and good loved and honoured him."

THE BRITISH EMPIRE SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY.

UNDER the presidency of Sir Henry Irving, and the patronage of many eminent men and women, the formation of this new Society is announced. Its purposes are :—

"1. To promote greater familiarity with Shakespeare's works among all classes throughout the British Empire.

"2. To help the rising generation not only to study Shakespeare's works, but to love them.

"3. To form Shakespeare Clubs and Reading Societies (or help those already existing in London) in the large provincial towns and in the Colonies.

"4. To encourage the study of Shakespeare by Prizes given yearly for the best reading, recitation, acted scene from his plays, or essay on Shakespeare by Members or Associates of the Society.

"It is proposed to organize readings and acted scenes from Shakespeare's plays as often 'as possible, and lectures on his life and works.

"There will be special classes and readings for children, with a view of making their early acquaintance with our greatest poet's works as pleasant as possible.

"All Members and Associates are requested to attend as many readings, &c., as possible ; to make the Society known to their friends.

"The Secretary will be glad if any person interested in the study of Shakespeare will communicate with her.

"MISS MORRITT, *Hon. Sec.*

"17, Southwell Gardens, London, S.W."

The Society's ends are so excellent, that everyone will wish it success. We can only regret, that judging from its motto—" *Using no other weapon but his name,*" the new Society should apparently think it necessary to place itself in an attitude antagonistic to us.

"NEW SHAKESPEAREANA."

WE have received from the Editor of the American quarterly, *New Shakespeareana*, a letter, in which he states: "Our position in the matter of this question (the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy), viz.,

that it is an important one and wants ventilation, has led us to be accused of being Baconian—a high crime and misdemeanour.”

New Shakespeareana is conducted by the New York Shakespeare Society, which includes among its members most Shakespeare scholars in Europe and America. We gratefully acknowledge so genuine and unexpected a handshake; and the assurance “*we are an open court*,” encourages the hope that, seeing we tread the same paths and seek the same ends, our present opponents and we may eventually join hands and work together for the world-wider appreciation of “Shakespeare.”

“THE expedition of the French against Naples . . . came with chalk in their hands to mark up their lodgings and not with weapons to fight. So we prefer that entry of Truth which comes peaceably, when the minds of men capable of lodging so great a guest are signed as it were with chalk, than that which comes with pugnacity and forces its way by contentions and controversies.”—*Francis Bacon*.

THE MASONIC SYMBOLISM OF INITIALS.

THERE will be found a confirmation of the suggestion that *initials* in various rearrangements are employed as Masonic symbols in *The Text Book of Freemasonry* (anon.) p. 237.

“The “C” typifies the Omnipotent and eternal Author of the Universe, having neither beginning nor ending; it also calls to our remembrance the grand and awful Hereafter or Futurity, where we hope to enjoy endless bliss and everlasting life. The characters which are placed on each angle of the T are Hebrew, and particularly worthy of our attention. The Aleph answering to

our A, the Beth to our B, and the Lamel to our L; take the "Aleph" and the "Beth," they form the word AB, meaning "Father"; take the Aleph and the Lamel, the word AL, which means word; take the Lamel and the Beth, they form the word LB, meaning Spirit; take the Beth, Aleph and Lamel, the word BAL, meaning Lord; take each angle of the triangle, they will form the following sentences: Father Lord, Word Lord, Spirit Lord."

De Quincey in his essay, entitled *Rosicrucians and Freemasons*, also states a fact that bears upon this subject. It is as follows:—

"The name of HIRAM was understood by the elder Freemasons as an anagram; H.I.R.A.M. meant (H)omo, (J)esus, (R)edemptor, (A)nimaru(M); others explained the name (H)omo, (J)esus, (R)ex, (A)ltissimus, (M)undi; others added a C to the Hiram, in order to make it (CH)ristus, (J)esus, &c."

CRYPTIC HEADLINES.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In reading Mr. Harold Bayley's interesting book, "*The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon*," I was particularly struck with the headlines consisting of vases of flowers placed side by side, which occur so frequently in books of the 16th and 17th centuries. Two points in particular attracted my attention. First, that the vases are in two, and only two, distinct forms; and secondly, that they are not symmetrically disposed, as one would expect, were they merely meant for ornament. Supposing then that these headlines were the hall-marks, so to speak, of a secret society with which Bacon was connected, it is evident that we have here the material for his biliteral cipher. I applied the cipher to one of the

illustrations which Mr. Bayley reproduces from "*The Compleat Ambassador*" (1655), and which I give here.



(By permission of Mr. Grant Richards).

It seemed to me that the bars—like the vases, unsymmetrically disposed—might be intended to enable the vases to do duty twice, and so get more letters out of a short headline. And that a natural meaning to give these bars would be the omission of the two portions enclosed between them. Now putting *a* and *b* to represent the two forms of vases and reading straight through by Bacon's alphabet, we get—

a b b | a b | a a a b a | a a a a | a a a
 O C A

I need hardly say with what surprise I found myself confronted with the three middle letters of Bacon's name, backwards, but in order. To complete the name, one letter is wanted at each end; and cutting out the portions between bars and reading one letter from each end, we get—

a b b | * * | a a a b a | * * * * | a a a
 N B

net result $N^{OCA}B$, which, of course, is *Bacon* backwards.

The result is, to say the least of it, curious, and if merely a coincidence, a very remarkable one. The process is perfectly symmetrical, and the mathematical chances against its exactly bringing out a word, and that *the* word, must be enormous. It seems to me to make it worth while to consider other similar headlines in this light.

Yours truly,

FLEMING FULCHER.

SIR TOBIE MATTHEW.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In your notice of the biography of Sir Tobie Matthew upon which I am engaged, you describe him as my "ancestor." This does me greater honour than I deserve! My illustrious kinsman left no descendants. He belonged to the branch of my family descending from Robert Matthew, of Castell-y-Mynach, in Glamorganshire. Mine descends from Robert's brother, Sir David Matthew, of Llandaff, whose offspring have dropped a "t" out of their name in course of their descent, whilst those of Robert have tacked on an "s," though the name varies almost as much in its orthography as that of Will Shakspeare.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. H. MATHEW.

"MURMURINGS OF THE AVON."

MISS MARIE CORELLI addresses us in the following terms:—

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIA" (*sic*).

Mason Croft, Stratford-on-Avon, Jan. 10th, 1903.

SIR,—I would as soon subscribe to a Magazine written by lunatics, and published at Colney Hatch, as to your BACONIA (*sic*), which is produced evidently merely to gratify the intermeddling pedantry of small modern scribblers, who, in their utter inability to do anything notable themselves, take up the scandalous business of robbing the world's greatest genius of his name and reputation. The people of this town—Stratford-on-Avon—have sufficient records of the living and grand personality of Shakespeare (apart from all the written testimony of his friends and compeers), to enable them to smile at the ridiculous attempts made by the ignorant and envious to disprove his fame. The donkey who brays out that Shakespeare "left no mention of his Plays in his will," chooses to forget that there was no literary copyright in the poet's time, and that, therefore, Plays which he (in the entire lack of pedantry and conceit which persuaded Lord Bacon—that *traitor to his country*—to mention every one of his productions by name, and even to set down the different libraries where he wished them lodged, in special bindings—good lack!) considered mere ephemera (*sic*), had no financial or legacy value whatever. No truly great genius has ever thought his own work precious. That kind of consequential pride in self is only manifested by persons like Mistress Gallup and the promoters of BACONIA (*sic*). May your few subscribers ever grow less!

MARIE CORELLI.

We are unwilling to mar the virgin freshness of this composition by superfluous comment ; but we have received from an anonymous source two anagrams that firmly establish Miss Corelli as the predestined and final authority on the question of authorship of the plays.

In the first, read downwards the *third* letter from the end of each line :—

Ti M on
The Winter's T A le
Henry Fou R th
Merchant of Ven I ce
Macb E th

Titus Androni C us
Love's Labor's L O st
Taming of the Sh R ew
The Temp E st
Othe L lo
Ham L et
Much Ado About Noth I ng

And to put the proof into another form and make assurance doubly sure, note the *fourth* letters from the end in the following rearrangement :—

Ha M let
Antony and Cleop A tra
Comedy of Er R ors
Henry the F I fth
Oth E llo

Richard the Se C ond
Venus and Ad O nis
Midsummer Night's D R eam
Lucr E tia
Romeo and Ju L iet
Cymbe L ine
Twelfth N I ght

In the light that these anagrams shed Miss Corelli's acidity of sentiment becomes less inexcusable.